DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 176 698 HE 011 865

AUTHOR O'Connell, William R., Jr., Ed.
TITLE Improving Undergraduate Education in the South.
INSTITUTION Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 72p.
AVAILABLE FROM Southern Regional Education Board, 130 Sixth St., N.W., Atlanta, GA 30313

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; *College Instruction; College Students; Curriculum Development; Educational Alternatives; Educational Assessment; Educational Change; Educational Innovation; Educational Objectives; Educational Quality; *Effective Teaching; Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Instructional Improvement; *Southern States; Teacher Improvement; Teaching Methods; *Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

Focus in this report is on ways to improve the learning process in higher education through programs aimed at the improvement of college teachers and college teaching methods. Divided in two sections (Regional Action for Change and Resources for Change), various authors present information on target areas for improvement. Such areas include competency-based education, programs for faculty improvement, improving instruction for undergraduates, and the development of human resources. Some changes suggested are: (1) off-campus education in the form of internship programs as well as credit given for past learning; (2) variations in the duration of education, such as the three-year bachelor's degree; (3) increased student participation in program development; and (4) changes and variations in teaching methods in the form of tutorial programs, independent study, and use of the media. Several methods of implementing change were adapted such as: a clearinghouse of information about programs of change and new directions; study areas in which change is contemplated or is taking place; establishment of authoritative bodies charged with making recommendations for change; and a program of information directed to those influential segments of the community likely to be interested in promoting educational change. Future SREB plans consist of putting into action the recommendations and ideas within this report. A listing of the regional resources for change in undergraduate education is appended. (LC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED176698

Improving Undergraduate Education in the South

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SREB

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 011 885

SREB

Southern Regional Education Board

Improving Undergraduate Education in the South

William R. O'Connell, Jr.
Editor

130 Sixth Street, N.W. • Atlanta, Georgia 30313 • 1979

SREB

Southern Regional Education Board

This book was made possible by funds granted by Carnegie Corporation of New York. The statements made and views expressed are solely the responsibility of the authors.

Foreword

In 1973, with the help of the Carnegie Corporation, SREB launched an effort to improve undergraduate education in the region. At the time, the air was still alive with responses to the educational ferment of the 1960s. Many educators, much concerned with "relevance," in effect had encouraged a new and vocal "consumerist" influence on curriculum development. SREB's effort was conceived as an exercise for promotion of "constructive change" in postsecondary educational practices.

As the project proceeded, its limits were sharpened, and its consumer-oriented objectives were meshed with tested lessons of past experience. From the many directions of possible constructive change which presented themselves, enhancement of faculty effectiveness was recognized as a particularly promising path to improvement. The present collection of papers reflects that focus and provides a sampling of ways in which the learning process may be enriched through programs aimed at improvement of college teachers and college teaching methods.

College and university faculty realize today that what they offer to their students must be designed to satisfy student needs and interests. They also know that among those pressing needs is the demand for realistic academic guidance in a rapidly changing environment. It is hoped that the experiences reported in this volume can contribute to a better understanding of how the academic world can remain better attuned to its growing responsibilities.

Winfred L. Godwin
President

Contents

FOREWORD iii

REGIONAL ACTION FOR CHANGE 1

Competency-Based Education 9
Robert Knott

Expanding Opportunities for Adult Learners in the Southern Region: One Point of View 15
Harriett W. Cabell

Programs for Faculty Development 21
Mary Lynn Crow

Staff Development in the Community College 27
Carol Zion

Improving Instruction for Undergraduates 32
Jeannine N. Webb

Faculty Evaluation and Institutional Rewards 37
John M. Bevan

DEVELOPING STRATEGIES AND RESOURCES FOR CHANGE 45

Encouraging Change on the College Campus 51
W. Edmund Moomaw

Lasting Impact of Reform: Development of Human Resources 56
John B. Stephenson

APPENDIX: Regional Resources 64

Regional Action for Change

American higher education began the decade of the Seventies with great expectations for changes to solve the problems highlighted by the turmoil of the Sixties.

The disruptions of the Sixties raised a self-consciousness about traditional academic practices which had never before been questioned. The problems which raised many questions included access to higher education for minorities, women, and older adults; the rigidity of arbitrary time frames for degrees; the extent to which instruction could be responsive to different learners and differing styles of learning; the "relevance" of what was being taught; and ultimately, who would make the decisions to solve the many problems which had been identified. Higher education was being subjected to tremendous pressures to respond to many, frequently contradictory, societal and constituent needs and interests.

National Recommendations

Nationally, a great debate began over the new directions open to postsecondary institutions. The ninety-second Congress passed the Educational Amendments of 1972 to the Higher Education Act of 1965, to provide assistance to improve postsecondary education. The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) was established to implement the goals of those amendments and to be a major force for positive change.

At the same time, several commissions were formed to study the problems of higher education, and their reports greatly expanded the dialog about the future of higher education at the outset of the Seventies. One of the most influential reports was from the Task Force on Higher Education (chaired by Frank Newman, then of Stanford University, now of the University of Rhode Island), which received its authority from and reported to the Secretary of HEW, although its work was encouraged and funded by the Ford Foundation.

The Newman Task Force addressed itself to problems facing higher education in the Seventies and "concentrated on how well the functioning of that system matched the public interest." Since this report was one of the earliest and had some official status, its recommendations influenced the educational amendments of 1972.

The Newman report stated succinctly the major themes addressed in various ways by several reports of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, chaired by Clark Kerr, and the Commission on Non-Traditional Study, chaired by Sam Gould. In the broadest sense, these groups were all dealing with the problems raised by the new diversity of students entering colleges and the rigidity and uniformity among institutions which seemed not to reflect the needs of society. All of the commissions implied or stated the need for a more responsive and diverse system and suggested possibilities for alternative paths to an education. The spirit of this national debate over the future of higher education is illustrated by the following statement from the Newman report:

> There has been reform, and its pace has been accelerated by the advent of student protest and the demands of minority groups. However, virtually all postwar reforms have been based on the assumption that growth, inner diversification of curriculums, and changes in governance will provide the needed solutions.
>
> We are convinced that the probable success of these kinds of reform is limited, for they leave unaffected the institutionalized past decisions as to what higher education is all

about. The system, with its massive inertia, resists fundamental change, rarely eliminates outmoded programs, ignores the differing needs of students, seldom questions its educational goals, and almost never creates new and different types of institutions. . . . We believe that only an intensive national effort can bring about sufficient change before the present opportunities for serious reform are lost.

(Report on Higher Education, DHEW.)

Innovative Responses

Institutions across the country already had begun to respond to the interests of these new students. Innovation and change were popular terms in higher educational circles throughout the nation during the middle and later Sixties — and the interest of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) was no exception. SREB publications, such as *Innovation in Collegiate Instruction* by Lewis Mayhew, and projects, like "Curriculum Improvement in Developing Institutions," were concerned not with mere variations on the familiar educational themes, but with recognition of the need for major breakthroughs affecting the structure and function of education. Other SREB projects, while not specifically defined in terms of change goals, were equally concerned with bringing about constructive change in the instructional process. Specifically, the SREB student intern project introduced the idea of off-campus learning and influenced many colleges to incorporate out-of-class learning for credit toward degrees.

By the early Seventies, the attention of higher educational leaders shifted from the somewhat general concern with innovation in the abstract to a number of specific areas in which the need for reform had been recognized.

Some of the areas developing as new approaches were:

Off-campus education — internship programs, cooperative education, credit for prior learning.

Variations in the duration of education — advanced placement programs, three-year bachelor's degree programs, external degrees and examination programs.

Changes in curriculum development and content — increased student participation in program determination, the development of problem-oriented curricula, e.g., the ecological curriculum, "Black Studies", urban studies, women's studies.

Changes and variations in teaching methods — tutorials, programmed learning, independent study, lecture-discussion combinations, and using media.

All of these possibilities and more were being seriously considered in the early Seventies. SREB had contributed to and even introduced some of those emerging approaches.

In the South

Although the South had not faced disruptions nearly as drastic as those that had taken place in other parts of the country in the Sixties, the need to consider new directions and change in the Seventies was recognized in this region as elsewhere.

State and institutional leaders encouraged SREB to serve as a central resource to facilitate desirable and orderly revisions in the content and structure of collegiate education. In December, 1971, SREB's Executive Committee, composed of governors, legislators, institutional presidents, and heads of state higher education agencies (chaired by then Governor Jimmy Carter), passed a motion calling for increased efforts to assist in educational innovation.

As a matter of fact, SREB both encouraged and responded to pressures for change from the region's political and educational leaders. In legislative conferences, governors' conferences, and annual Board meetings, SREB had called attention to current reassessments of higher education and to proposals for structural and academic reforms. For example, in 1971, Clark Kerr addressed both the SREB Legislative Work Conference and the Southern Governors' Conference on the recommendations made by the Carnegie Commission in *Less Time, More Options*. In 1972, the SREB Board meeting symposium and Legislative Work Conference heard speeches and discussions by such outstanding proponents of change as Ernest Boyer on shortening undergraduate degrees, Walter Perry on the British Open University, Sam

Gould on general non-traditional approaches, and David Sweet on the new Minnesota Metropolitan State College.

The higher education community in the South also showed growing interest in new possibilities for the structure and content of higher education and in non-traditional approaches being suggested for the undergraduate level. Small experiments with one or another approach were springing up here and there, although often in isolation and unaware of similar revisions underway or planned elsewhere. Also, experimentation too often was undertaken without prior recognition of the extent to which changes may force a rethinking of the content and purposes of the educational program. The result was failure to share relevant ideas and experiences, and general lack of coordination of effort.

SREB had long been actively concerned with the improvement of undergraduate education and saw an opportunity to be of service to the region during that new period of ferment. The Board had published monographs on faculty recruitment and retention, curriculum reform, and improvement of teaching. Its Institute for Higher Educational Opportunity gave major attention to encouraging and supporting curriculum reform in black colleges, with substantial funding from several private foundations. The SREB public information program also directed attention to new directions and reform of undergraduate education in several issues of SREB newsletters.

SREB Constituency Interests

Additional encouragement for SREB to take an active role in promoting and implementing change came from participants representing institutions in meetings concerned with specific new developments. For example:

- A group of students, faculty members, and administrators, meeting to review experience gained in off-campus learning programs, urged SREB to give leadership to additional, extensive, in-depth exploration of all facets of off-campus learning and the development of guidelines for program management.
- Representatives of fledgling external degree programs and two boards of regents in the region, in a small invitational meeting, recommended that SREB conduct additional exploration of such programs, offer workshops for faculty and administrators, establish a regional clearinghouse for program information, provide a regional consultative service, and create a formal advisory committee to give continuing direction to regional activities related to external degrees.
- In a conference on "Approaches to the Time-Shortened Undergraduate Degree," sponsored by SREB, some 70 faculty, administrators, and students made recommendations which included the following:

  > That SREB actively support the philosophy of time-variable or time-independent degree programs . . . encourage the exploration without prejudice of this whole area . . . facilitate coordination and communication between colleges and universities experimenting with time-varied degree programs.
  >
  > That SREB provide mechanisms for gathering and disseminating detailed information about all known time-varied degree programs.
  >
  > That SREB create a task force to consider and design models which may be used in various types of educational institutions. . . .

Undergraduate Education Reform Project

Given its history of interests in improving curriculum and instruction and the call from many of its constituent groups to provide leadership for reform in undergraduate education, SREB began its educational reform program in 1973, with support from a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The regional program set out to:

> Increase the willingness of the higher educational community to re-examine undergraduate education and consider ways to better serve a more diverse population at times, in places and with methods that had not been traditional.

Encourage a greater number of sound options for formal study leading to baccalaureate degrees or just meeting individual desires for continued learning throughout life.

Arrange for inter-institutional sharing and the involvement of state systems in reform activities.

Help develop plans for new ways to strengthen undergraduate education.

Several mechanisms which have served in other SREB general program activities were adapted to the implementation of the reform project. These traditional approaches as adapted include:

A clearinghouse of information about programs of change and new directions;

Study of areas in which change is contemplated or is taking place;

Establishment of authoritative bodies charged with making recommendations for change in the region;

A program of information directed toward influential segments of the community who can be interested in promoting educational changes.

The history of SREB and its past program impact assisted greatly in planning activities in the encouragement of constructive change.

The specific project approach to encouraging educational change included (1) the assessment of directions in which change seemed likely to occur, given the continuing impetus of agents such as SREB, (2) selection of those types of changes which deserved the most vigorous encouragement, and (3) choice of the approaches most appropriate for dealing with the objectives chosen.

Themes and Procedures

To accomplish these objectives, the Undergraduate Education Reform project set out to: identify new and nontraditional approaches through staff contacts with institutions, state agencies, and national and regional leaders; study revisions in undergraduate programs through *ad hoc* work groups and staff activities; and disseminate information about new developments through newsletters, publications, conferences and workshops, mutual interest work groups, and direct consultation.

A key element in the accomplishments of the project has been the authority and responsibility granted the staff to determine project sequence and direction. In carrying out this responsibility, decisions were based on an awareness and understanding of trends and needs in higher education, information from evaluations by participants, advice from *ad hoc* advisory or work groups, and extensive staff field work throughout the South. Staff spent a great deal of time consulting on campuses, observing outstanding approaches in use, speaking on nontraditional developments at conferences and faculty institutes, and serving successfully as program evaluators.

For example, during one period, the associate director addressed meetings of the faculty at Texas Tech University and Murray State University on forms of faculty development and participated on a panel on innovation at the national meeting of the Council on Inter-institutional Leadership. Similarly, the project director addressed the 200-member Southern regional Council on Collegiate Education in Nursing on new directions in higher education, helped evaluate the freshman seminar program at Lander College (South Carolina), and was on a three-person review team to evaluate the Florida International University External Degree for the State University System of Florida. Such activities served the dual purpose of helping to keep the staff informed of new developments and providing opportunities to disseminate information about the developments, issues and concepts the project was established to promote.

Focus on Programs

The project began in 1973 with the idea of helping institutions and state systems throughout the South consider the development of non-traditional approaches within the context of their purposes, goals, and resources.

At the time of the original proposal there was particular interest nationally and in the region in external and time-shortened degree programs to serve new, non-traditional students. The project immediately formed two work groups to assist the staff in designing activities to all institutions in these two areas.

The work group on non-residential degree programs and the project staff set out to identify examples of programs of this type and disseminate information to the region. An SREB *Regional Spotlight* newsletter describing ways of "Meeting the Needs of Non-Traditional Students" stimulated broad interest and requests from institutions for information and assistance. The staff and work group members provided direct assistance to institutions considering developing external-type degree programs, although some were only interested in exploring the general concept. However, the project staff worked closely with the Alabama Consortium for the Development of Higher Education (ACDHE) to develop plans for a Consortium degree in the six member institutions. The ACDHE subsequently received grants from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) to develop an Alabama open learning program.

The project provided staff assistance and funding to New College of the University of Alabama to develop an orientation course and handbook for its new External Degree Program. As a means of highlighting these newer programs for adults, the project published a report on the successful External Degree Program at Florida International University, which was distributed to all institutions in the 14 SREB states.

Considering Educational Outcomes

The work group on time-free curricula began by investigating various approaches to shortening undergraduate degrees and the staff reviewed the Admissions Partnership Program at Appalachian State University in North Carolina which provided admission to college for selected high school juniors. It soon became evident that the time-base of an educational program, whether three-year, four-year, or more, is not the central issue. The work group members concluded that the central focus of concern should be on what learners are to learn, rather than when or how they learn it -- in short, on the outcomes of education rather than the process. Accordingly, the work group shifted its focus of concentration to "competency-based curricula (CBC)," a concept which was being developed in a few colleges and heavily promoted between 1973 and 1975 as a special funding category of FIPSE.

The work of this group led to a large regional conference on competency-based curricula. That conference, held in June, 1974, was attended by 155 persons from 65 colleges and universities, 11 state systems of higher education, and several consortia. Participants came with a commitment to examine the underlying concepts of CBC, identify and analyze the issues and implications of CBC, and determine their own stage of development and possible future interest in the concept. Following the conference, the staff prepared *A CBC Primer*, published in January, 1975, to report on the conference and serve as an introduction to that growing popular concept. The *Primer* received wide regional and national attention as a source book for program planners.

While the idea of competency curriculum was not wholly accepted by a great number of institutions, the project continued to work with several institutions on the development of CBC programs. These institutions included Mars Hill College, North Carolina; Our Lady of the Lake University, Texas; Miami Dade Community College, Florida; the School of the Arts at Virginia Commonwealth University; and the University of Kentucky Community College System. The ideas triggered by the flurry of interest in CBC several years ago have had effects beyond the number of programs which actually have been developed on a competency base. Once faculty begin to seriously discuss the outcomes of education or even take a first step toward considering the concept, they begin to think about their work in different terms. While there are very few competency institutions or programs, there are many more programs today that reflect the influence of "competency" than there were before 1973. The area of competency curricula is explored in more depth in an article in the next section of this book.

Focus on Faculty

During the first several years of the project it became increasingly clear that working toward reform was essentially work toward affecting attitudes. Therefore, the project devoted more attention to activities aimed at helping faculty and administrators develop more positive attitudes toward the need for change and then helping them gain new skills and abilities needed in changed circumstances.

The staff concluded that a major priority had to be placed on communicating with institutional faculty about new needs and changing goals for higher education and alternative approaches to teaching and learning. The diversity of students in our institutions as a result of open access to higher education means that traditional assumptions and modes of thought about goals and procedures no longer hold. Consequently, the project planned and conducted a number of activities designed to bring faculty face to face with the non-traditional needs and possibilities for undergraduate education in this region with the hope of changing and improving existing programs and approaches.

Workshops and Conferences

To help faculty address some of these issues and enhance their effectiveness, the project provided opportunities to participate in regional inter-institutional workshops and conferences aimed at specific aspects of professional development, such as teaching methodology, advising, and test improvements.

Workshops composed of demonstration activities were held to help faculty members learn about aspects of contemporary teaching methodologies, such as ways of individualizing instruction, specific techniques like the Keller plan or Personalized Systems of Instruction or the audio-tutorial method, use of media in the classroom, various programmed learning approaches, interdisciplinary approaches, and improving classroom communication. Other workshops were held on advising, ways of evaluating student learning in different settings, crediting prior learning, and improving testing and grading procedures. Each workshop dealt with a specific, discrete topic and offered theoretical conception and especially, operational information on the subject. The workshops provided demonstrations of actual programs in operation and encouraged active involvement of participants in these new learning methods.

Activities Focused on Disciplines

To encourage faculty to consider innovative or new approaches in their own teaching, the project planned activities to involve them in the consideration of successful innovations in the humanities and the sciences for 1,555 selected faculty from the two and four-year institutions in the state of Tennessee. Three different workshops were held for faculty from clusters of disciplines who teach in 18 colleges in Georgia. Workshop leaders were professors from the same disciplines who teach their courses by using the innovative or individualized instruction process demonstrated.

By having faculty participants work with successful innovations being used by their own disciplinary colleagues, the workshops overcame the resistance which is often brought on when faculty feel they are being lectured to by people who know nothing of their discipline and how to teach it.

In addition the project worked with several regional disciplinary association groups. A workshop was sponsored on teaching for the Georgia Political Science Association, assistance was given to a regional committee working on setting goals for undergraduate sociology as part of a national project, and a conference was held on history in the undergraduate curriculum and the role of teaching assistants.

The major effort, focused on a specific discipline, was a set of activities running over a four-year period with the Southern Speech Communication Association (SSCA). The first activity was a three-day workshop on improving instruction in the basic course, attended by 75 faculty and administrators. Workshop leaders were instructors of speech communication courses who used innovative approaches in their own teaching, such as personalized system of instruction, cognitive mapping, and behavioral objectives. Numerous participants reported revising their courses as a result of the workshop and the Association appointed a special task force on improving teaching which continued to work with the project on special activities. By way of providing special assistance for curriculum and teaching improvement, the project, working with the SSCA Committee, selected three departments, from applications, to receive assistance

over a two-year period. The project sponsored three visits to each campus by a team of speech communications specialists who reviewed the departmental program, faculty concerns and needs, and the relationships of the department to other parts of the institution.

The first visit was exploratory, the second was to conduct a workshop for the department on possible changes that might be made in light of the information collected on the first visit, and the third visit served to check on any impact the project was having on the department. Each participating department reported positive assistance from their participation and visible improvements. Subsequently, the project brought together the visiting teams, selected faculty from the participating department, representatives of the SSCA and the national Association of Communication Administrators (ACA), as a means of preparing additional persons who can provide these services to more departments and to encourage the SSCA to adopt full sponsorship of this effort on a continuing basis. Both the SSCA and the ACA have agreed to promote this effort among speech communication departments and the SSCA has established a permanent committee to continue this work and to propose a plan to make this service a regular part of the Association. This model is one which could serve other disciplinary associations.

Programs for Faculty Development

The project worked with institutional programs for faculty and instructional development and the staff assisted institutions not involved in systematic faculty development to analyze their local needs and to plan appropriate activities to meet those needs. The project sponsored a workshop on designing and implementing staff development programs for teams from 12 community colleges in the region. This workshop helped the teams come to grips with the meaning of staff development and ways to design and implement programs suited to their own institutional needs. Follow-up visits were made to all the institutions in order to assist and encourage the new programs. *Community College Staff Development: Basic Issues in Planning*, a report in the form of a manual for designing programs, was published by SREB following the workshop. At least nine of the 12 colleges subsequently appointed a staff development officer and implemented the plans made at the workshop. Staff of several of these colleges have continued to serve as resource persons for others just beginning new programs.

A significant development for serving faculty are campus faculty and instructional development centers. These centers, staffed by persons with expertise in faculty development, provide assistance to faculty for redesigning courses, evaluating their classroom performance, and changing teaching methods. Many centers help faculty deal with personal aspects of their professional roles and a few assist faculty to make career changes. The project identified those campus centers in the region and sponsored a meeting of directors and other staff to stimulate communication and cooperation, examine ways in which these centers function, and exchange ideas.

Subsequently, the project sponsored several activites related to these centers, and developed a booklet, *Faculty Development Centers in Southern Universities*, which summarized this aspect of the faculty development movement and described procedures used in establishing and operating centers.

The directors and other staff of these centers continued to meet and work together. They developed close relationships which led to exchanging information and serving as consultants for one another. At the last project-sponsored meeting, the group, representing 16 centers, decided to form an association which will continue to exchange information through an informal newsletter.

Project staff assisted many other institutions with faculty development through consultation visits, speeches to faculties or their committees, correspondence and telephone contact.

Faculty Evaluation

Institutions in the Southern region, like those in the rest of the nation, must balance their concern about the quality of education in the face of diversity, with pressures for effectiveness in accomplishing their specified goals. Accountability is a major theme outside, and reluctantly inside, the institution — accountability in fiscal matters, accountability in education programming, accountability in serving society.

With the traditional mobility of faculty no longer a dominant characteristic of higher education, much of the accountability pressure lies with faculty. On the other side, institutions must prepare for long-term commitments to the individuals who now staff them. Therefore, it is fitting for institutions to encourage faculty to constantly assess the quality of their work and continually grow as professionals.

Evaluating faculty performance for purposes of promotion, tenure, and pay is of singular importance today. In addition, it is also vital that evaluation procedures and processes include provisions for helping faculty improve their performance.

To deal with this important matter, so integrally related to the success of reform efforts, a regional task force was formed to carefully review current practices, identify outstanding and successful approaches to evaluating faculty, and develop recommendations for institutional or system action that would stimulate improved evaluation procedures and promotion and reward structures that incorporate emerging new knowledge about ways to increase teaching effectiveness.

This work group of seven members represented both public and private higher education and included knowledgeable and thoughtful individuals experienced in attempting to improve the quality of faculty performance.

During the first year they worked together, the group examined the results of SREB research studies of evaluation in order to arrive at conclusions about the character of faculty evaluation and the procedures used. These conclusions and a set of recommendations for improving evaluation practices were published with the results of the research studies and disseminated widely through two regional conferences on faculty evaluation.

The two following years the task force served as the advisory committee for an expanded project activity supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. Through that effort, the project assisted 30 colleges and universities to address concerns about their evaluation progress and to plan and implement more comprehensive and systematic approaches. Most of these institutions also gave a great deal of attention to ways of relating the evaluation process to procedures for faculty development.

In keeping with the project's major theme of providing resources and information for continual use, the sections which follow will discuss in some depth aspects of the major themes of the work in this project. Hopefully the ideas and information will be of continuing use to the reader and be an additional contribution of the project to the continuing reform of undergraduate education in this region. A full report of the faculty evaluation project has been produced by SREB separately.

An Assessment of Competency-Based Education

Robert Knott
Gardner-Webb College

The appeal of competency-based education has ebbed and flowed over the past few years. Even before substantial curricular developments had occurred under the rubric of competency-based education, the enthusiasm with which the concept was endorsed evidenced itself in characteristics common to social movements. The wide variety of educational programs which claimed to be competency-based have enjoyed mixed success during their implementation. Still, the interest in and exploration of competency-based education remains almost unexplicably high despite the many difficulties encountered by the practitioners in the field.

In an insightful article on the sources of societal interest in competency-based education, David Riesman identified an underlying American preoccupation with competence as being a fundamental source of the popularity of competency-based education. (*5*) Riesman also noted that, within the educational community, a group of educators was beginning to take issue with the existing preoccupation with verbal and quantitative skills as the major means by which the competence of students was assessed. The Interest of these educators reenforced by broader societal concerns with competence gave rise to the experimentation with competency-based education (CBE) which has characterized much of the 1970s.

In 1974, staff of the Southern Regional Education Board sensed the importance of the broad interest in competency-based education and, under the auspices of the Undergraduate Education Reform Project, a conference on competency-based education was held. The published report of the conference, *A CBC Primer*, stated that the conference "was planned and executed on the premise that there exist more questions than answers about competency, that there are few experts on the subject . . . that CBC is not a panacea for all of higher education . . . [but] some of the implications can stimulate significant developments in higher education as we know it." (*4*)

In the early 1970s, there were few institutions in the country working toward the development of a total curriculum on a competency base. One of those institutions was Mars Hill College in North Carolina. The work at Mars Hill was directed by Robert Knott, who is one of the most knowledgeable people in the country about the concept of competency. Dr. Knott contributed to the early national dialogue about the values of this concept for institutions and has served as a consultant to many institutions planning competency programs. Dr. Knott served as a member of the Undergraduate Education Reform Project committee on competency, assisted a number of institutions through this part of the project's work and has written extensively on this topic. Since leaving Mars Hill College, Dr. Knott has been Vice President and Dean at Arkansas College and is currently Executive Vice President and Dean of the College at Gardner-Webb College in North Carolina.

Several years later, as the Undergraduate Education Reform Project now draws to a close, it is appropriate to briefly assess the contributions of competency-based education. More particularly, the time has come to see if further clarity has been gained in refining the questions about CBE explored in the early SREB conference and in supplying some answers to those questions.

The SREB conference defined competency-based education in broad terms. That definition still seems appropriate today.

> Competency-based education is education that focuses on the outcomes of the formal educational process so that those outcomes are defined, agreed upon, and publicly stated in terms of assessable student behaviors. Appropriate assessment instruments and processes are developed and learning experiences designed to assist students in gaining the required competencies are offered.

This understanding of competency-based education does not include the specification of any particular teaching mode or strategy, and/or special curriculum. It does require that a consensus be reached on the expectations for students which are to result from educational experiences and that the expectations be stated in terms of assessable behaviors.

This understanding of competency-based education which prevailed at the early SREB conference appears in retrospect to have been genuinely insightful. Focusing in a broad manner on educational outcomes precluded any tendency to link competency-based education to a reductionistic approach to the statement of outcomes from a strictly behaviorist perspective. Ralph Tyler cautioned at the outset that if significant educational rethinking and renewal is to occur from competency-based education, it would be critically important to avoid such reductionism in approaches to educational programs (*4*)

Several comments from one of Tyler's earlier works add to this understanding:

> If you look carefully at [the 1945 Harvard Report], you will see that they, too, were trying to formulate general education in terms of major aspects of human behavior.
>
> I think many people who are trying to use behavioral objectives today perceive them as very specific kinds of behavior. If they consider that's what schools are all about, they are confusing knowing answers with being educated. . . .
>
> We should be less interested in whether students have acquired a bunch of little answers to little questions and more concerned with whether they conceive of human learning as a means by which they are able to work out answers to their own problems because they have acquired intellectual tools. Equally important is whether they have the attitude toward life that enables them to approach the tasks of living with initiative and creativity. (*6*)

Many of the major contributions of competency-based education have come from educators who sought to develop a kind of competency in their students which was rooted in a broad self-confidence deriving from the educational experience. Many of the qualities of this competency were not "strictly academic" but "were rather the qualities of caring, of cooperation, of inventiveness, and – in the case of professional programs – of being able to provide superior professional services that were more concerned with individual clients than with the institutional frameworks in which the services were delivered." (*5*)

Faculty Renewal

An unwavering commitment to the required consensus on the fundamental outcomes of an educational process is one of the chief characteristics of successful competency-based educational programs. Where faculties have been committed enough to competency-based education to see them through the very difficult stages of initial disagreement, consensus on the fundamental outcomes has been reached. Many of these faculties have gained a renewed sense of educational purpose and mission through engagement in the difficult process of stating educational outcomes in terms of assessable student behavior. This process has often forced a deep rethinking of the aims and purposes of education and forced discussion of those aims beyond generalities to the statement of specific expectations of students.

As a result of this rethinking, the most exciting single development resulting from the process of building a competency-based educational program appears to be the new life that many faculties have gained as they rethought the fundamentals of both their disciplines and their understandings of the educational process. The renewed vigor with which these faculties approached their educational tasks has given life to many educational environments. Where this revitalization of the educational environment has occurred, it alone is worth the expenditure of time and effort which was required by a competency-based educational program. Ironically, while competency-based education focuses on outcomes stated in terms of the expectations of students, its major impact appears to be in the area of faculty renewal and development. Faculty concern with the student learning outcomes which result from the instructional program produces a self-monitoring effect for the faculty which focuses attention on the success and failure of the faculty as instructors.

> Faculty members are supposed to be professionals, subject to self-imposed demands, and are supposed to establish their own competence. It is here that competency-based education is likely to have its greatest impact. It seems clear that the core competence finally at stake in the competency-based movement is that of faculty members themselves, and only secondarily that of students or other professionals, whether nurses, social workers, or lawyers. Only a small minority of faculty members is willing, let alone eager, to monitor and to be monitored. But an influential number of faculty members, including some who have become administrators, have been responding less to legislative mandates and public pressures for accountability than to a concern intrinsic to education itself: the concern for what students can do rather than for what the faculty believe they have taught. (*5*)

Although this development was not fully anticipated by those who initially engaged in the development of competency-based education, it does not come fully as a surprise since many of these faculty were vitally interested in increasing the impact of educational programs upon students. Indeed, what has been called the "crisis of the diploma" to be addressed by more rigorous standards under competency-based education, is in reality a crisis of confidence in the professoriate. The diploma itself, under competency-based education or any other approach to education, will never be stronger than the expertise and dedication of the faculty.

Assessment of Students

The observation that competency-based education's major impact will probably be on faculty self-monitoring and improvement as a result of some intrinsic concerns with education itself, must be balanced with the realization that competency-based education places a major emphasis on broadening and improving the approach to the assessment of students. It is only fair to ask whether or not the early claims for contributions toward making the assessment of students more sophisticated have been realized.

After reviewing the evidence gathered from many experiments with competency-based education, Donald Hoyt concluded that few of the early claims about improved approaches to assessment made by those engaged in competency-based education can now be substantiated. (*3*) Hoyt concluded that competency-based assessment has not improved significantly upon judgment by consensus. Although some recent projects in assessment, undertaken by the Education Testing Service, do hold promise, presently strong evidence is not available to support a claim that competency-based assessment is more reliable than other modes.

Hoyt further concludes that "there is reason to believe that the *content validity* of the average competence measure will exceed the content validity of most traditional measures." (*3*) This conclusion is encouraging in light of the initial impetus which led many educators into competency-based education. Their desire to more directly relate broadened understandings of competence to the education of students, including improved assessment of those competencies in students, appears to be issuing in some positive contributions. However, the conclusions on the ability of competency-based education to generate improved assessment are still very tentative. Much more evidence needs to be gathered to confirm these early observations.

Ironically again, the tendency to dwell on the techniques and methods of assessment almost to the exclusion of other educational concerns has developed as one of the more serious weaknesses of competency-based education. While appropriate assessment may be one of the weakest elements in contemporary education, the failure of many educators to realize that informed professional judgment is an acceptable approach to assessment has led as much discussion away from central educational concerns as has the reductionistic approach to the statement of curricular outcomes. Competency-based education will not make its strongest contribution by creating more "objective" assessment of students.

Hoyt aptly observes that as different faculties formulate different conceptions of competence and implement educational programs designed under the influence of those conceptions of competence, the problem of transferability of credit will be magnified rather than reduced.

Competency-based approaches to assessment appear to be generating more creative and better integrated approaches than have traditional achievement examinations. This contribution is not surprising given the early orientation of many of the developers of competency-based education. Better integrated approaches to assessment when coupled with broader and more subtle definitions of competence do offer hope. However, "the competency-based education movements are not likely to provide the creditability for which their critics ask until the time comes – and quite conceivably, it may not come – when this work on assessment becomes sufficiently subtle and sophisticated to be able to measure with reasonably convincing accuracy the often impalpable qualities that some proponents claim they are already able to determine." (*5*)

Response of Students

Student enthusiasm for competency-based education appears to be mixed. Although an understanding of the rationale of the curriculum which they enter has increased, the growth of their enthusiasm for the new program has not always accompanied the growth of their understanding. Students are particularly concerned when assessment is designed to transcend course experiences. Their previous educational experience taught them how to survive in a course-based curriculum and assessment beyond courses is both unknown and threatening.

The major change in students working in a competency-based education program is often the rise in the level of understanding of the goals which shape their educational experience. A renewed faculty sense of rationale and purpose for the educational process appears to be directly communicated to students. Students begin to ask questions about learning experiences and courses which are relevant to the program rationale to which they have been introduced. Hence, students tend to become more active in the process of shaping their own educational experience once they have understood the basic rationale around which a particular program in which they are participating has been designed.

However, unless special care is taken in preparing students for successful entrance to a competency-based educational program, the availability of many alternatives designed to respond to student individual needs appears to the student as an impossible maze of requirements. Hence, again, we must conclude that it is not student enthusiasm nor improved assessment which has been the major contribution of competency-based education thus far. It is the renewal of faculty through the serious rethinking of educational purposes which has become the movement's major contribution.

Stating Curricular Outcomes

As faculty have been engaged in rethinking educational programs in terms of competencies, the implicit assumption in competency-based education – that the criteria for evaluation of student competence are to be made explicit in public – has caused concern that this approach to education is unnecessarily narrow. The prior specification of assessment criteria generally has been interpreted to mean that only certain types of learning objectives are acceptable in a competency-based curriculum: *cognitive* objectives which state intellectual abilities or skills to be demonstrated by the learner; *performance* objectives which state required abilities needed in the performance of selected activities; *consequence* objectives which state

required results which must follow a learner's actions. Exploratory objectives which list experiences that are thought to hold potential for significant learning are not acceptable, at least not acceptable in that form. (*2*)

However, the type of learning objective most difficult to state in terms of explicit assessment criteria, yet, also, most critical to be a meaningful conception of liberal education is the affective objective. If the affective learning objective does not lend itself to statement in terms of specific criteria then it must be excluded from the competency-based curriculum. If it were excluded, certainly no conception of liberal education would be consistent with a competency-based curriculum.

> It was conventional for professors to declare that their teaching was strictly neutral, and to wax indignant at colleagues who might be suspected of propaganda. Apparently the supposedly neutral professors were unaware that the history of education – a subject which did not concern them, though it dealt with their own calling – shows that the philosophy of education – a subject which they found too flimsy for serious consideration – indicated that education in its very nature is indoctrination, not merely because it dispenses selected knowledge but also because it inculcates, directly or indirectly, doctrines, opinions, and attitudes. Thus, in its entrance requirements the university indoctrinated. In its zeal for efficiency, for power and service, for the entire programme of the humanitarian movement, the university indoctrinated. (*1*)

In general, competency-based education programs give evidence that stating curricular outcomes in terms of expectations of students has forced attention to the underlying value dimensions of curriculum development. A greater sophistication among faculty in explicitly addressing value questions within the curriculum appears to be occurring as faculty wrestle with the concerns of competency-based education. As long as the dangers of molding students arbitrarily are openly discussed, the early concerns about unnecessary manipulation of students under a competency-based educational program appear to be unfounded.

Future of Competency-Based Education

From these observations about past developments in competency-based education we can now look briefly to the future of competency-based education. Particularly in the public schools, three diverse forces in contemporary education – the call for increased accountability, the move "back to basics," and a desire for increased objectivity and evaluation – have combined under the rubric of competency-based education to generate a testing movement which is often unrelated to any re-examination of desirable educational outcomes. If, under the name of competency-based education, quick and easy answers are sought to the complex problems of contemporary education then, far from improving educational practices, competency-based education will have become a vehicle toward further deterioration of educational accomplishments.

However, the desire to rethink the ends of education, to design assessment processes which are consistent with the statement of reformulated ends, and the development of courses of instruction which are truly means to achieving those ends are worthwhile activities which can result from a proper application of the concept of competency-based education to contemporary educational problems. Should the recent move toward competency-based testing be only an initial step in that direction, then the efforts are to be applauded and we can look forward to their contributions as they mature.

For many of those engaged in competency-based education, the intellectual challenge of rethinking educational ends and disciplinary contributions has been genuinely rewarding. The joining of enthusiasm, openness to intellectual and personal challenge, and cautiousness in accepting easy answers are probably the critical ingredients necessary for productive work in competency-based education. When these are present, competency-based education appears to be successfully making its contribution as one effective strategy for educational renewal among other strategies which have proved effective in the academic community.

REFERENCES

1. Norman Foerster, *The American State University*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1937, p. 150.
2. Robert Houston and Robert Howsam, *Competency-Based Education*, Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1972.
3. Donald Hoyt, "Competence as a Basis for Credit and Credentialing" in *Credentialing Educational Accomplishments*, edited by Jerry Miller and Olive Mills, Washington: American Council on Education, 1978, pp. 130-158.
4. William R. O'Connell, Jr. and W. Edmund Moomaw, *A CBC Primer*, Atlanta: Southern Regional Educa- Board, 1975.
5. David Riesman, "Society's Rewards for Competence" in *On Competency*, Riesman and others, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979, pp. 18-65.
6. Ralph Tyler, "Ralph Tyler Discusses Behavioral Objectives" in *Today's Education*, September-October, 1973, pp. 43-44.

20

Expanding Opportunities For Adult Learners In the Southern Region: One Point of View

Harriett W. Cabell
New College, University of Alabama

The Southern region is fast becoming a land of educational as well as economic opportunity. Higher education is moving toward a diverse system of educational alternatives for students in both the private and public sectors, including such old established institutions as The University of Alabama (1831) and newer institutions, such as Florida International University (1972).

A variety of educational opportunities for broad spectrums of the population include evening programs, weekend colleges, external degrees, and community college systems. The spectacular rise of such diverse programs for adults in Southern colleges and universities signals the end of the notion, even in an area noted for its conservatism, that college is just for the young.

Attitudes are changing, and although higher education has for years offered educational opportunities to adults through extension programs and part-time and evening studies, providing learning options for adults has not been a central function. A major university reported that as late as 1974 its vice president questioned the wisdom of allowing a 60 year-old person to enter an external degree program and consume resources provided by the taxpayers. "What can that student do for the university at that age?" he asked.

Responses from some professionals in the field of higher education notwithstanding, the adult learner is increasingly demanding continuing education or lifelong learning with different structures of teaching and learning as well as degree and non-degree programs. In 1976, the U.S. Census Bureau reported a 26.3 percent increase in part-time enrollment between 1973 and 1975, with enrollments increasing 108 percent in the 30 to 34 age group alone. At this rate, the Bureau reported, by 1980, adults could represent 40 percent of the total student population.

The simultaneous and often conflicting pressures of diverse student populations representing ever-widening age spans, backgrounds, and educational goals, and a society with lifelong learning needs emerging in a region which a little over a hundred years ago prohibited schooling for a huge segment of

---

As this article points out, returning adult students expect different things from an institution than traditional college-age students. One of those things is a staff that understands the needs, desires, and concerns adults have about the new venture they are undertaking. Harriett Cabell directs a program for adults and is highly capable of responding to those needs because of her own experiences as an adult learner. Dr. Cabell's background illustrates the interesting career patterns of adults who have returned to professional life and advanced education. She has served as a director of training for Headstart programs, taught in the College of Home Economics as well as in the New College at the University of Alabama before beginning her job as Director of the External Degree Program. Dr. Cabell shares important insights into the needs of adult learners and the opportunities for serving them in the Southern region.

these people have resulted in a widespread concern for serving the needs of adult learners. As the population of adult learners grows in number, and the individual learning needs represented within this population become more varied, the task of fitting these potential students into existing internal degree programs becomes ever more difficult.

The Adult Learner

Pressures felt from lifestyles, job changes, children leaving home, retirement, and a sense of unfinished business are among the reasons that adults enter learning activities. In contrast to the traditional college student, the adult learner returns to school not just for a degree or credential but to meet certain fundamental human needs as well — ranging from skills in personal development to means for survival in the changing job market. Education should be a process which serves a personal as well as informational need. There is a danger, however, that some adult programs serve only as administrative organizations to arrange prescribed learning into a curriculum that leads to a degree, or worse still, as a way for institutions to swell decreasing enrollments. A student's stated goal of a credential might be met by the institution without much thought or attention to that student's personal development. When personal needs are not met, the adult learner often drops out or withdraws from the institution, or completes the requirements for a degree with a feeling of "Well, I did it, but is this all there is?"

Too often in the past, institutions have responded to students with an attitude of "do what I say because I say so," fostering dependence rather than independence. The feeling of helplessness still persists and is often carried over by adult students who do not feel very capable in terms of school success. A prominent community leader expressed this idea upon entering an adult learning program: "I'm glad we're not taking a test but are taking an inventory. My wife won't know what failing an inventory is."

Adults often enter programs expecting to be treated like children, and they may become angry or disoriented if everything is not systematically prescribed. I remarked to one student, "I know you're enjoying your Sociology course. That's a good professor, I've always heard." The student replied, "Well, I don't know. I paid my money for him to teach, and he wants me to discuss!" On the other hand, the same students, having been in the adult roles of independent breadwinner or homemaker, become angry and resistant when forced for too long a time into a dependent role, though this very dependency was originally desired. In a Social Science seminar, a 40 year-old man worked as a team member with two 18 year-olds and one 25 year-old on the problems of custodial care in mental institutions. At first he reported feeling angry at the leader because of the lack of an observable structure to the class and because the leader refused to tell him exactly what to do. He also resented the younger students' questioning his judgments and proposing "ridiculous solutions" he knew "wouldn't work." Finally the group, through a re-learning process, began to listen to each other. Cooperative new ways of learning were developed, and the formerly disgruntled 40 year-old student reported great elation at his new learning role, that of treating other students with dignity and participating in discussions as teacher and learner.

Adult learners bring into the learning situation a great reservoir of experience that becomes an increasingly large resource for learning. Often programs fail to respect and build on these experiences. A young businessman reported disgust with an adult program when a young professor attempted to relate to the adult students by way of his "marketing experience." Later the professor grew defensive when classmates questioned his assumptions, and his "experience" turned out to be that of a part-time salesperson during Christmas holidays. By negating the adult's contributions and equating in-depth career experiences with such shallow and superficial events, the professor caused the class to lose confidence in the material, the professor himself, and eventually the institution.

The adult's perspective moves from that of the traditional student's postponed application of knowledge, to one which involves immediacy of application. However, there is evidence that adults too have developed "teachable moments" or readiness based on developmental needs. Courses concerned with preparation for retirement, or how to invest one's income, seem remote to students in their 20s, yet these same courses are often oversubscribed when offered to those in their 40s or 50s. It is essential for institutions preparing an educational environment for lifelong learning to have some special knowledge of adult learning. Without this special knowledge, the future for the new clientele is perhaps not as bright as one might hope.

Higher Education's Responses

In the early Seventies, along with national thrusts toward individualized education, a number of concurrent efforts to stimulate thinking on alternative approaches to learning and diverse delivery systems of education for increasingly heterogeneous student populations were developing in the Southeast, as elsewhere.

For the past six years the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) has focused on action programs of various formats to assist faculty and administrators in considering ways to improve undergraduate study in the region. On the national front, the Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning (CAEL) began in 1974. This group involved the Educational Testing Service and a task force of nine institutions, including the New College of the University of Alabama. Since its inception, CAEL (now referred to as the Council for the Advancement of Experiential Learning) has grown to include over 300 member institutions, with a number of representatives in each state of the SREB region, and has continued to explore the nature of experiential learning through national assembly meetings, sectional meetings, projects, and publications.

In the fall of 1974, at about the same time as CAEL's beginnings, the Danforth Foundation founded, as one of five centers, the Center for Individualized Education (CIE) at New York State's Empire State College, with the objective of improving the processes of teaching and learning with a heavy emphasis on understanding the needs of adults. Empire State College, along with a network of seven other institutions, including New College at the University of Alabama, focused on faculty-student relationships, individualized learning objectives, evaluation, faculty load, and faculty development. This network met periodically to develop and explore institutional programs with teams of faculty members and administrators from each of the institutions working on various developmental projects within the individual institutions.

Competency-based learning and external or long-distance learning are names for strategies for increasing the learning options for the number of increasingly diverse students in changing times, and each has been studied from a number of points of view as a result of the efforts by SREB to stimulate and guide educational change.

As part of the competency-based movement sweeping the country in the early Seventies, Mars Hill College in North Carolina, adopted a totally competency-based curriculum. The work of Mars Hill College led to SREB's hosting an Atlanta meeting in 1974 involving 45 colleges and universities and 155 participants, all concerned with what "learners are to learn." As a result of that meeting, the *CBC Primer* (1975), the "*McGuffey's Reader* of competency-based curriculum," was published by SREB and the participants began to assess what is known about learning theory and to re-evaluate old ideas concerning training the mind.

The Emerging External Degree

Around the same time, the idea of new kinds of degrees to serve adults became popular. The work of the Commission on Non-traditional Study, along with the spectacular development of The British Open University (1971), generated widespread interest in new delivery systems for adult learners with their increasingly varied needs. The concept of the external degree had a powerful impact on the academic community with Cyril O. Houle's publication, *The External Degree*, in which the external degree was defined as one "which is awarded to an individual on the basis of some program of preparation (devised either by himself or by an educational institution) which is not centered on traditional patterns of residential collegiate or university study." (*2, pp. 14-15*)

To those seeking to develop responsive programs for adult learners, the external degree seemed to be an idea whose time had come. Different forms of external degree programs had emerged, ranging from New York's Regents Degree Program and Empire State to the University Without Walls (UWW) programs sponsored by the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities. The Southern region developed its own versions, including the University of Alabama's External Degree Program and the External Degree Program of the State University System of Florida, administered by Florida International University (FIU). These were essentially demonstration projects of the University-Without-Walls concept, utilizing such options as contract and prior learning. Each program attempted to heed Houle's admonition, "If

the idea is to be taken seriously, either the originator or somebody else must design a program which fully considers policies of admission, teaching, evaluation, and certification." (*2, p. 15*) However, with these basic considerations as guidelines, two very different educational delivery systems developed.

The External Degree At Florida International University

From its genesis in 1970, reportedly on the back of a napkin in a hotel bar in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the External Degree Program at Florida International University grew, eventually receiving unanimous authorization from the Florida Board of Regents in 1972. In order to be admitted to this program, the student must be a resident of Florida and "must have an Associate's degree, 60 semester or 90 quarter hours, or the equivalent." (*5, p. 7*) After the student is admitted, the student, a faculty member, and an External Degree Program counselor design an educational contract. This contract may include transfer credit, credit for prior experiential learning, and the design of a study plan, incorporating both course work and independent study. When the student has completed the work as detailed in the contract, the student earns a degree. As of June 1979, the program had graduated 575 students. The SREB project provided Florida International University with the opportunity to present a case history of the Florida program in a publication, *The External Degree Program*.

Alabama External Degree

The University of Alabama's External Degree Program has elements in common with that of Florida International University, but is, in fact, quite different, as it is not a statewide program. Rather, it is a part of a degree-granting unit, New College, set in a very traditional university. In 1973 a faculty committee, convened by the President of the University, completed a one-year planning study of something called the "External Degree Program for Adult Learners." Some referred to the project as the "University Program Without Walls," some, the "University Version of the British Open University," and others, the "External Degree Program," while a few intimated in the beginning that it was "a crazy idea of the administration."

Dr. Neal Berte, the first Dean of the New College and current President of Birmingham-Southern College, forged the vague plan of the committee into reality, with a pilot group of 20 students in 1974. At present, nearly 500 students, with a median age of 38 and representing 10 Southeastern states and five foreign countries, are completing their degrees in this highly individualized program. Each student is required to attend an intensive orientation (the *only* time the student must be physically present on the campus). The orientation attempts to accomplish three things: (1) identify each student's transferred credits and make general plans for the student's completing the degree; (2) train the student in contract writing for out-of-class learning; and (3) train the student in how to attain credit for prior out-of-class learning. Each student's curriculum requirements, which may be met by a variety of delivery systems, include humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, a depth study (or interdisciplinary major), and elective work, and culminate in a final 12 credit-hour project. This individualized external delivery system leads to a traditional B.A. or B.S. degree from the University of Alabama.

Clifton Fadiman's pronouncement, "For most people, life is just a search for the right manila folder in which to get filed away," and the admonitory "take a look at your life . . ." appear on the cover of the orientation guidebook, developed and critiqued under the auspices of the SREB project for the Alabama External Degree Program.

Each of these programs represents a different method for meeting adult learners' needs under the umbrella of the label "external degree." Each has been active in CAEL from its beginning and each has received assistance, both directly and indirectly, from the Southern Regional Education Board project.

These projects have not been cited because they are the most effective of their types, but are merely being recognized as examples of institutions working toward expanding their potential student clientele. Additional solutions, if deemed appropriate, may be developed in the same or other settings.

These manifestations of extending opportunities to adult learners are as varied as the forms of American education in general, and the motivations for their existence are equally varied, as well as complex, ranging from the laudatory desire to broaden educational opportunities to the practical and less high-minded wish to fill educational coffers by boosting failing enrollments.

The Development of New Professionals

To examine the role of new individualized options in external learning is to look at new professionals and new professional networks. Some would argue that the new professional, for one reason or another, is outside of the "publish or perish" mode of faculty development. From personal observation, I have found that some of the new professionals are women who've entered the higher educational field at a later time, bypassing the traditional linear track from graduate school to assistant professor, to associate professor, to professor, and are seeking positions of authority and importance. Others are administrators and/or teachers who have been "shattered by the grand illusion and are seeking new alternatives for themselves." (*Ll, pp. 263-276*)

Connie Clark, assistant director of the External Degree Program of Florida International University, and I, as director of the University of Alabama External Degree Program, are two cases in point. Neither of us had heard the term "experiential learning" six years ago, although each of us was working in a program providing experiential learning. Ms. Clark was directing a self-help program in a prison and I was teaching courses at the University of Alabama in human development and directing educational training for Headstart teachers. Each of us is an example of experiencing lifelong learning on a personal level, as well as attempting to provide similar opportunities for others. Each has attended and conducted workshops, published in our area, directed programs, and completed – or is engaged in – a doctoral program emphasizing individualized learning.

The decision to work in external delivery programs is not always viewed as wise. One participant in an SREB workshop reported a public outcry among colleagues over her decision to head such a program. One member of the philosophy department at her institution warned, "You'll ruin your career with a second-rate correspondence school."

Ideally, the new professional will not be viewed as second-rate or out of the mainstream of the educational community. New professionals will need the kind of institutional support that does not penalize those facilitators of learning who are committed to finding new opportunities for increasingly diverse students in our complex society. A supposedly funny story describes the new Ph.D., Dr. Smith, who is on dogsled with a new M.D., Dr. Smith. In trying to distinguish between the two, the steward describes the Ph.D. as, "the one who can't do anyone any good." If this attitude is prevalent in today's society, not only the new educator but the old educator is indeed in trouble.

Summary

The increasing adult enrollment, along with the activity of CAEL, SREB, FIPSE, and the external degree movement, have resulted in the development of special programs and a number of new professionals in every state in the Southern region. Recently, Eckerd College, a private institution in Florida, has instituted a special degree program for experiential learners. Other institutions, such as Memphis State University in Tennessee, have developed nontraditional components within traditional frameworks, while others, such as Mary Baldwin College, Staunton, Virginia, have created programs designed specifically to meet the needs of women. As programs spring up in a variety of forms all over the region, the question needs to be asked, "What is being done within these programs to create an educational environment for the students entering the program?"

Considerable progress toward stimulating constructive change in undergraduate education in the South has been made through the SREB project, although it is obvious that institutions and their programs vary a great deal. However, if external degrees and individualized options are to remain, suspicions and resistance which exist in some circles should not be underestimated. Despite the increasing number of adult learners, the scarcity of allocation of resources, and the failure to integrate practices, such as experiential learning and credit for prior learning, into the fabric of the institution give one pause.

However, at least some of the newer practices of admission, instruction, evaluation, and certification are applicable to many forms of higher education in the region. The leaders in the region must continue the work begun by SREB and take full leadership in strengthening this educational innovation. "When men build on false grounds, the more they build, the greater is the ruins." (Thomas Hobbes)

REFERENCES

1. Knowlton, Harold E., "Adult Development," *Educational Record*, Volume 57, Number 4, Fall, 1976.
2. Houle, Cyril O., *The External Degree*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1973.
3. Southern Regional Education Board, *The External Degree Program, Florida International University*, Atlanta, 1977.

Programs for Faculty Development

Mary Lynn Crow
The University of Texas at Arlington

The belief that student learning can be facilitated by improving the quality of instruction has existed as long as have our institutions of higher education. Certainly the belief existed prior to the establishment of programs for faculty development, which have been primarily a phenomenon of the late 1960s and the 1970s; but the belief has never before been institutionalized to this extent. Today, programs to improve instruction at the college and university level are located on more than half the campuses across the country, are funded both internally and externally, and many are staffed by full-time professionals who have professional journals, national conferences, and even their own professional association to support them.

Before the advent of the faculty development movement, institutions made their own early attempts to improve the quality of their instructional programs. The traditional procedure was to increase the library holdings within subject matter fields, to recruit for the faculty new Ph.D.s from the best schools who would bring with them new ideas, to reduce class size or lower the student-faculty ratio, and to increase the university's acquisitions in the area of instructional hardware and media. (*1, pp. 3-5*) The belief was that a successful learning experience would occur to the extent that (a) fine quality minds with access to (b) fine quality books, periodicals, and media could interact with (c) small groups of fine quality students.

Today, universities are attempting to improve the quality of instruction in college classrooms in more sophisticated ways, but at least one main objective is still to improve student learning. As programs to reach these objectives continue to evolve, many institutions are expanding their definition of faculty development to a broader and more inclusive mission. Programs sometimes approach the instructional function of the faculty members directly by presenting a wide array of preservice and inservice education programs to prepare faculty members to teach more efficiently and effectively. Other programs concentrate their efforts upon the entire institution as the academic milieu within which the faculty members, administration, and staff must function in all of their respective roles. Some programs direct their efforts to individual faculty members and include assistance to them in all of their professional roles and activities in addition to emphasis upon their personal careers. These three approaches are often called, respectively, instructional, organizational, and faculty (or personal) development. And, of course, some professional development programs attempt to do all of these things or various parts of them to differing extents.

Mary Lynn Crow, author of this chapter, is the immediate past executive director of the National Professional and Organization Development Network and has served as a consultant to many programs, both old and new, for faculty development across the country. She is the director of the Faculty Development Center at the University of Texas at Arlington and speaks from firsthand experience about the development and operation of campus programs to assist faculty. Dr. Crow has worked with the Undergraduate Education Reform Project as a member of several committees and she contributed to a major publication which described the centers in the Southern region.

Defining Faculty Development

Faculty development may best be defined as an attitude, a belief, a commitment – not a position or a given set of activities. This commitment to assistance in the growth and development of institutions and their staffs can be propagated or implemented by and through a variety of internal or external titles or roles. (*3, p. 34*)

What this work is called is also in process of change and evolution. While *faculty development* still appears to be the most frequently used designation, other terms, such as instructional development, organizational development, professional development, teaching effectiveness, and faculty or staff resources, are all commonly used. The three most commonly used titles (as of 1976) were *Educational Development, Faculty Development,* and *Instructional Development.* (*2, p. 5*)

What is a program for faculty development? In line with the definition of faculty development as any activity or role based on a commitment to the systematic growth and development of institutions and the faculty and staff within them, a program could be the work of any individual, group of individuals, office, center or unit, consortium, or network, whose efforts include instructional, organizational, administrative, staff, or faculty development by whatever term it may be known. Such programs sometimes operate within a single academic department or college, but often serve an entire campus. They may be budgeted by institutional funds or by funds from one or more grants. Networks and consortia (both formal and informal) operate across institutional boundaries and, again, can be funded either by the participating institutions or by grants. Individuals who "do" faculty, instructional, or professional development activities include administrators who do this as one part of their regular academic duties as well as committees who do it with or without additional compensation or released time. Clearly such programs vary greatly in the size and nature of staff and in the kind and nature of activities. The only factor that identifies them all as "programs for faculty development" is their common mission and goals.

What such programs specifically do in attempting to accomplish their mission, goals, and objectives also varies greatly. Campus-based programs almost all become involved to some extent in instructional or curricular improvement efforts. Some also provide assistance in the development of the other roles academics play, such as researchers, authors, committee members, student advisors, etc. On some campuses, faculty development means awarding grants to teachers for instigating or implementing some innovative classroom procedure, or for doing research on teaching; on some, it is giving prizes or awards for outstanding teaching; on some, it is granting sabbaticals or leaves of absence for a teacher to study, write, travel, develop new instructional materials, or get an advanced degree; and on others, it is providing assistance for dealing with mid-life changes, personal concerns, career transitions, and planning one's professional future. (*4, pp. 6-7*)

The activities that are planned, funded, or implemented by programs for faculty development also differ in the extent to which they accomplish the specific objectives to be met. Formats for providing services include seminars, workshops, off-campus retreats, team-building activities, short courses, open-forum discussions, credit-courses, evaluation systems, projects, research, task forces, direct consultation, instructional diagnosis, personal counseling, instructional materials, faculty retraining and exchange programs, visitation by off-campus experts, resource areas and libraries, communication mechanisms such as publications and newsletters, award programs, grants, media services, and the provision of direct funds for travel and tuition for continued inservice growth.

Staff for Faculty Development Programs

Programs for faculty development are staffed by people from across all academic disciplines and by persons who occupy all of the roles within the academic environment – undergraduate and graduate students, teachers, administrators, staff members, independent consultants, and people who are working within government and private agencies as well as within the professional associations. Campus-based programs that have an institutionalized center or office to coordinate faculty development efforts are usually led by a center director. In Gaff's overview of 142 professional faculty development workers, the

"average" staff member was found to be trained in education or educational psychology, have a doctoral degree, and hold a faculty appointment. Directors whose centers work primarily toward instructional development have backgrounds in education, instructional media and technology, learning theory, and sytems theory. Directors whose centers focus on organizational development have backgrounds in organizational theory, organizational change, and group process. Directors whose programs stress personal or individual faculty development come from clinical, developmental, and social psychology; psychiatry; or fields that emphasize socialization. (*5, pp. 9 and 152*) In Erickson's study of 26 centers around the country it was found that most center directors and senior professional staff come primarily from education and secondarily from psychology. (*6, p. 69*)

Developing Networks

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, programs for faculty development were few, geographically isolated, and virtually without communication between them or about them. Without some kind of catalytic group or force, these early efforts probably would never have evolved to what is today a nationally-recognized movement in higher education. Perhaps the first real catalyst was provided by national associations (such as the American Association for Higher Education) which scheduled sessions at their national conventions to give the early faculty development pioneers a public forum for their ideas. People got together, exchanged ideas and mailing addresses, and informal networking began.

Because of the geographical (and thus communication) barriers separating isolated programs, regional associations, consortia, and informal collaborative efforts served an essential function in assuring the growth and perhaps even the survival of the programs. In the 14 Southern states the Undergraduate Education Reform Project of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) filled this need.

Soon after the project began in July of 1973, SREB staff members began to visit individual institutions in the region in an attempt to identify existing faculty development programs and centers. In the fall of 1974, a three-day meeting was held in Lexington, Kentucky for directors of these centers. Representatives from 22 institutions interested in exploring the establishment of centers also attended to hear directors discuss their activities and their results. It was the first time the directors of such centers met together, and their collaboration and ongoing projects continued through 1979 under the sponsorship and funding of the Project.

One early result of this regional Southern collaboration occurred in the spring of 1976 with the publication *Faculty Development Centers in Southern Universities* (*4*), which was made available to all of the Southern centers as well as to all institutions in the region. The book (4,000 copies of which were distributed) included a chapter on how faculty development centers could be started, plus separate chapters describing activities of each of the existing 11 centers in the 14 Southern States. A center was included only if it was institutionally recognized, served the entire campus, was officially staffed, and was at a senior college or university. The 11 university programs were at the University of Alabama, the University of Alabama at Birmingham, University of Florida, University of Kentucky, Appalachian State University, Memphis State University, University of Tennessee - Knoxville, University of Texas at Arlington, University of Texas at Austin, Virginia Commonwealth University, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. These centers varied greatly in size of staff and budget. The largest center in the region had a staff of six full-time professionals, several part-time faculty, more than a dozen students, and an annual budget including staff salaries in excess of $900,000. The smallest center, on the other hand, had one part-time professional and an annual budget under $10,000. People who read the book contacted the center directors individually as well as the SREB staff to seek assistance in setting up similar centers on their own campuses.

Southern center directors met in the summer and again in the fall of 1976 to plan a series of regional activities, including the administration of a survey to determine the needs and interests of all the centers regarding the establishment of staff training opportunities. In February of 1977, a three-day workshop was held at the University of Southern Mississippi at Gulfport, with all center directors attending. In the fall of 1977, another planning group met and began a three-part project: to study center evaluations, to investigate the present status of all the Southern centers, and to contemplate the future of all the centers. During the winter of 1978, the center directors met again in Atlanta, Georgia, to continue their work on the three-pronged project.

The last center directors' meeting was held in February 1979, at which time final reports on all three phases of the project were made. Since this was the last meeting that was held under the sponsorship of the Undergraduate Education Reform Project of SREB and the Carnegie grant, the Southern directors agreed to continue their regional collaboration by forming an informal organization to be called the Consortium of Southern Regional Faculty and Instructional Development Centers. The membership had reached 17 centers in the 14 Southern states. Centers that had joined the ranks since 1976 included those at Florida State University, Murray State University, Southern University in New Orleans, University of Mississippi, University of Houston - Downtown College, and Old Dominion University. (Only one of the original 11 centers closed – at the University of Alabama at Birmingham.) A steering committee was appointed and plans were made to hold annual meetings and to assist newly-forming centers in Southern institutions.

At the national level, too, the faculty development movement is experiencing a greater level of acceptance. Judging by the number of books and periodicals, the number of national meetings and conferences, the number of funding agencies willing to support such work, and the existence of a national professional organization devoted to faculty development, one would have to conclude that academics are becoming aware of the fact that this new movement is a force to be acknowledged.

One sign of the establishment of a new component of academic life is the existence of a professional organization established to propagate its beliefs and commitments. Organized in 1976, the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education, called the POD Network, is "an association of individuals committed to the advancement of higher education through professional development, instructional improvement, and institutional change." The membership is composed of faculty development workers, consultants, campus administrators, professors, graduate students, and others who are involved with or interested in the future of colleges and universities and their faculty and staff. Members are afforded opportunities to grow both professionally and personally through a national refereed journal, national conferences, regional training workshops, and collaborative projects whereby they can share information, exchange resources, and generally learn from and support one another.

The Future for Faculty Development Programs

Future trends that involve either faculty development workers, their constituencies, or the milieu within which they exist are as complex as is the future of higher education, and certainly they are interrelated. Some trends, however, that appear to be within the career span of current faculty development programs are:

- **A greater tendency toward the use of growth contracts for faculty and administrators as a logical extension of the emphasis upon individualized learning and growth for students.**
  Often, trends in public school education impact upon college and university classrooms; the trend toward individualizing instruction is an example. Based upon the current emphasis on individualizing instruction for students, there will probably be a movement toward emphasizing individualized growth patterns for faculty members and administrators. This emphasis may be expressed, for example, by a greater utilization of some form of the growth contract which institutions like Gordon College, Massachusetts, and Austin College, Texas, are using.

- **More emphasis upon instructional development by individual professional disciplinary associations.**
  Glenn Linden describes a multi-institutional, multi-level faculty development program endorsed and supported by the American Historical Association. The project is centered at State University of New York, Stony Brook, and has included one university, four community colleges, and several middle and high schools. According to Linden, "This has made it possible for many teachers at the various institutions to meet and discuss their common problems and to begin to find answers to these common problems. The result of these efforts is a model of cooperation and accomplishment that can be profitably studied by those interested in faculty development." (*7, p. 64*) Linden concludes, "It is clear that cooperation between teachers at two- and four-year institutions, as well as elementary and secondary educators, is an absolute necessity in the years to come." (*7, p. 69*) Such activity on the part of the

professional associations which have subject matter credibility may eventually be an answer to one problem educators face – the belief that people without training in a specific discipline cannot be as helpful to teachers within that discipline as people who do have training within it.

- **A closer liaison between faculty development and continuing education.**
  The two terms get at the same seed thought – that people need to continue their education throughout their professional lives and that education does not stop at the point of graduation or at the receipt of a terminal degree.

  Offices of continuing education were established to serve other populations when institutions of higher learning avoided the fact that their own needs for continuing education were being ignored. Now, on many campuses, there are two offices to serve the continuing education needs of faculty and non-faculty. At some not-too-distant point, both offices may benefit by sharing their strengths as they work toward a common goal.

- **A closer liaison between institutional research (IR) and planning and faculty development.**
  Ultimately, faculty development will not be successful unless there is cooperation and collaboration between the two. Data about students, faculty, and the institution must be collected and analyzed scientifically. Offices of IR collect data; faculty development programs need this data and should identify needed data that IR does not normally collect. Colleges and universities need both offices, and each would operate more meaningfully with the support and involvement of the other.

- **Additional constituencies, such as administrators, students, and staff, will need to be included.**
  Eventually, all of these constituencies may be served by the offices now called faculty development, particularly in small colleges or professional schools.

  A colleague in nursing education in Texas will soon become the director of a single unit that will serve three populations: faculty, administrators, and students. In an attempt to integrate the developmental needs of everyone at this small professional college, the administration has decided that the needs are not that different. Some of the specific activities that serve students differ from the activities that serve faculty, but their discipline and many of their needs are the same. By having one office attempt to analyze and fulfill the three groups' needs, they feel that they will achieve economy and efficiency.

- **There will be more emphasis on service to academic administrators.**
  This move is both logical and overdue. Most administrators were faculty members originally, and many will return to the faculty near the end of their careers.

- **A movement toward the organization of regional consortia or informal networks of faculty development programs to consolidate sparse monetary and human resources.**
  As budgets become tighter, faculty development workers will tend to cooperate and collaborate to get the most out of their meager resources. Workshop leaders and speakers can visit other campuses as a trade-off, and institutions can make common purchases of films and videotapes. These survival liaisons may be formal or informal and will, in the long run, result from attempts to preserve a movement to which its workers feel a deep sense of commitment.

- **A growing interest in faculty exchange programs for retraining, re-educating, or relocating faculty to meet changing curricular patterns.**
  As changes occur in curriculum, areas of academic emphasis, and degree requirements, more and more faculty members will find themselves tenured into an institution that no longer needs their particular teaching field, while the institution across the street (or across the country) may need them. Faculty development programs will face the challenge of helping colleges and universities instigate exchange programs of mutual benefit. These programs may also involve the provision of additional education in another teaching area or specialty to allow a professor to remain on his/her own campus, but to be utilized in a more productive capacity.

- **More emphasis on faculty career guidance.**
  The provision of career guidance for students is considered essential. It should also be essential to provide such guidance and counseling to faculty members and administrators. This might take the form

of guidance regarding work in the academic milieu or assistance in making an orderly transition to a non-academic career.

- **More emphasis upon the systematic development of comprehensive formative and summative evaluation systems for all members of the academic community – students, faculty, administrators, and other staff.**

- **Institutions will need to financially support their own faculty development programs.**
  There can be no long-range stability or vision if campus-based programs must depend upon the continuation of external funding for survival.

- **Finally, institutions will need to pay someone to administer the faculty development program.**
  While academics will temporarily do this type of committee or individual work on a voluntary basis, eventually faculty development work must be recognized as an essential institutional component by providing direct and equitable compensation for it, just as campuses now provide for other directors in service areas, such as institutional research, continuing education, the library, student services, research offices, development offices, alumni associations, etc.

REFERENCES

1. Bergquist, William H. and Phillips, Steven R., *A Handbook for Faculty Development*, Washington, D.C., The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975.
2. Crow, Mary Lynn, "Faculty Development: What's in a Name?" *Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education*, Volume 2, Issue 1, Spring, 1976.
3. Crow, Mary Lynn, "The Future," *Journal of Teacher Education*, Volume 29, Number 3, May-June, 1978.
4. Crow, Mary Lynn; Ohmer, Milton; Moomaw, W. Edmund; and O'Connell, William R., Jr. (eds.), *Faculty Development Centers in Southern Universities*, Atlanta, Southern Regional Education Board, 1976.
5. Gaff, Jerry G., *Toward Faculty Renewal*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1975.
6. Erickson, Bette LaSere, "A Survey of the Inservice Training Needs and Interests of Instructional Improvement Centers," unpublished dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1975.
7. Linden, Glenn, "Multi-institutional, Multi-level Faculty Development Program," *Education Horizons*, Volume 55, Number 2, Winter, 1976-77.

Staff Development in the Community College

Carol Zion
Miami-Dade Community College

Background

Professional development activities have always been carried out by community colleges. These activities may have been in the form of sending faculty to conferences, bringing consultants to campus, faculty orientation sessions, released time for program development, or workshops on special topics or themes. These have been traditional approaches to staff development, but it was not until the 1970s that institutions began to organize and coordinate all of these activities to obtain maximum benefits.

Florida has taken a leadership role in staff development. Impetus for the development movement in the state of Florida was provided by the State Board of Education in 1968. A ruling provided that three percent of the amount paid in salaries for the current year had to be set aside for development purposes the following year.

This ruling was amended in 1972 by a State Board of Education regulation which stated that two percent of the current year's revenue from the state had to be allocated in the next year's budget as development funds.

Both funding formulas have resulted in approximately the same dollar amount. Discretion in the application of these funds is left to the individual colleges. Each college must submit yearly development plans and a year-end report documenting the implementation of those plans. Initial planning may be modified as long as it is accompanied by justification for the changes.

Consortia of community colleges began springing up during the late 1960s and most of them have included staff development among their functions. The League for Innovation and GT-70 were two major consortiums involving community colleges. Smaller regional consortiums were also formed to support development programs and development staff as well. In 1973, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) sponsored a conference on the theme, "new staff for new students," which focused on the staff development movement in the community colleges. It was during this period that

---

Staff development has been a matter of concern in community colleges, longer perhaps than in the four-year institutions. Some of the greatest contributions to the newer faculty development programs have come from early workers in staff development programs in the community colleges. Carol Zion is one of the pioneers in this field. She has contributed to the current development of improved programs across the country and was influential in establishing the Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. She has worked with many institutions in the Southern region through the Undergraduate Education Reform Project by serving as a consultant for workshops and as a campus consultant on relating faculty evaluation and faculty development. She is Director of Management and Organization Development at Miami-Dade Community College in Miami, Florida.

state associations for faculty development were organized so that representatives from individual campuses could exchange ideas and share information with one another. Special sessions were offered at the AACJC National Conference meetings to consider the possibility of forming a national association. The National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development in the Community Colleges (NCSPOD) was established in October 1977, following regional workshops as well as these special sessions. The majority of community colleges now produce newsletters that review the activities of staff development on their campuses and NCSPOD and state associations provide the means for an exchange of information among many colleges. Support for staff development activities in the community college has had campus, state, regional, and national bases.

Philosophy of the Programs

While staff development functions have been formally organized and coordinated in the majority of community colleges, foci vary from college to college. At some institutions the emphasis is on program development; at others, it is on increasing instructional effectiveness. In the first instance, the stress is on curricular changes and instituting new programs of study. Interdivisional cooperation in designing interdisciplinary courses, introducing additional department electives, or developing new special types of programs are aspects of this approach. In the latter case, learning resources centers are actively involved in helping faculty package their courses, develop resource materials, and employ a variety of instructional strategies. Howard County Community College in Maryland has been a leader in this approach.

Still another system, which has been used sparingly but is gaining momentum, is the organizational development approach to staff development. The rationale for organizational development is that a development effort cannot be piecemeal. Curricular innovations cannot be separated from the staff's development as human beings, nor can classroom innovation be separated from the total organizational innovation. Meaningful innovation in teaching and management must reflect a well-thought-out philosophy, honestly adhered to in the stated goals and objectives, organizational format, management practices and procedures, and teaching strategies and evaluative techniques.

Further justification for a totally integrated effort is the recognition that development of an individual, unit, or group will affect other individuals, units, or groups. Changes in faculty behavior, administrative behavior, or program structure ripple in a "domino" effect throughout the organization. For example, the development office might support a faculty member in turning his course into one of self-paced learning, but such a change involves the bookstore in the ordering of materials, the Registrar in record-keeping, and even Veterans' Affairs in grading procedures which are tied to students' receipt of government benefits. An integrated system involves all those who would be affected by a change in the initial planning as well as the later implementation. Miami-Dade Community College, North, is an example of a campus which has adopted an integrated, organizational development framework for all professional development activities.

A basic assumption in community college staff development programs is that such an effort must capitalize on the unique talents and professionalism of the existing staff. The thrust tends to be to identify these talents and to utilize them, not only within the areas in which the individuals are located, but across the entire campus. Most development programs try to involve an exchange of skills in an interactive process whereby individuals can explore their relationship to the instructional program as well as to the total mission of the organization.

Another important aspect of development programs is that the program itself must be subject to change. It is as easy for staff development people to be seduced by a single strategy as it is for faculty to adhere to one instructional activity or for management personnel to cling to a single style. If workshops are successful one year, it does not mean this should necessarily be the development plan for the second year. One-to-one consultation, task groups, human relations training, support groups, etc. all have validity at different times. The program should be a model for the growth, change, and responsiveness that it is asking others to demonstrate by reassessing goals, strategies, and offerings every year. As community college staff development programs mature, it has become increasingly obvious that program activities need to be modified in relation to changing pressures and environmental conditions.

Goal Setting

The best staff development programs are based on assessed needs of the institution, and are closely related to institutional goals. Many community colleges find themselves in difficulty as staff development programs are carried out in the absence of very clear campus goals which can yield specific objectives for the staff development program. Under the best circumstances, the priorities for the staff development program are selected from the campus objectives and buttressed by a *needs* survey of the staff. In other words, staff development activities emerge from the identification of needs – whether the needs have been recognized through activities of the organization, a set of objectives for the year, or an assessment of the more specific needs identified by individual faculty members and administrators. In this way, institutional goals and personal/professional goals can merge and be serviced by the development program.

It is easier to assess institutional need than institutional readiness for staff development. Today, however, the external pressures of fluctuating departmental enrollments, financial constraints, and student consumerism are bringing about a readiness that was difficult to obtain when enrollments were soaring and money was easy to come by.

Another factor contributing to institutional readiness is the age of the community college movement itself. Most of the institutions have passed the stage of pioneering euphoria – they are old enough to see the problems and still young enough to do something about them.

Organization

There are many organizational patterns for staff development programs in the community college. The larger institutions tend to give responsibility for staff development to a single individual, often aided by a staff. Sometimes the faculty development center or office also has an advisory committee to help determine priorities and programs; the smaller institutions tend to operate with a committee structure. Sometimes the chairperson of the committee is given some released time for his/her work in staff development. At the larger institutions, the person responsible for staff development reports either to the president or a dean. At the smaller institutions, an academic dean is often given the responsibility for developing the program and the budget.

Funding and Program Support

There isn't much mystery connected with starting and maintaining a successful staff development program. Staff development requires time and it requires resources – both of which imply funding. We might say, "He who controls the budget controls the initial take-off." There has never been a successful staff development program that did not have the full backing of management personnel in commitment of time, resources, and money. Even in this period of tight budgets, there still is the possibility that this might be given funding priority. One can have cut-backs after a program has been successfully operated, because at that point staff have been infused with the spirit of development, but the initial program must receive full support. It is here that institutional grants and support by outside agencies have been so helpful. When an institution has limited funds for the support of staff development, special programs, such as those conducted by the Undergraduate Education Reform Project of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), have afforded institutions the opportunity for planning and gaining the skills necessary for a well-run staff development operation. When such an agency is used to train people on the campus and to supply them with the necessary initial consultant help, there are long-term benefits. A one-time workshop or consultation does not have lasting benefits. Individuals may become enthusiastic over new ideas, but it is only through follow-up and additional training that ideas are transformed into operational procedures. One of the best approaches to getting started with limited funds, which has been supported regionally in the South, is through the use of college teams. This is an important approach because one individual gaining expertise without the corroboration of colleagues often has a difficult time explaining programming to the rest of the college staff. The team approach means that more than one person has

received information and some training in how to establish a program as well as having a campus support group for spreading ideas and implementing the program.

In recent years, outside agencies have moved from the support of "general" staff development activities to a concentration on specific skills, topics, or target groups. The Office of Continuing Education and Public Service at the University of Illinois, headed by Dr. Charles Kozoll, sponsored a two-and-a-half-year project on the professional development and supervision of part-time faculty. Fifteen community colleges participated in the project, which was funded by the Illinois Office of Education, Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education. In addition to arranging seminars for training and information exchange, the project produced an excellent handbook on the supervision of part-time faculty for the participating colleges.

Projects for Educational Development, funded by the Cleveland Foundation, the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, and the Ohio Board of Regents, sponsored an Administrative Development Fellowship Program for 40 chairpersons (17 of whom came from community or technical colleges). This project, co-directed by Dr. Lance Buhl and Dr. Sam Lane, gave recognition to the importance of the chairperson's role in planning, training, and evaluating, and to the need for effective department management. This project has also produced a handbook of materials to serve as a resource for department heads and is a helpful guide to others planning such a program.

Funding for staff development programs, while essential, need not tax the organization's budget. Often, the least expensive interventions have the most decisive impact. When people learn to use the resources that are already available on the campus, the budget support for staff development can be greatly reduced. Staff development, while aided by hardware, computer systems, etc., is basically a "people" operation and sometimes the dollars for released time and training are not as great as administrators might anticipate. An evaluation of priorities can help to shift budget funds from questionable areas to activities that will yield management and instructional benefits.

Evaluation

Until recently, few development programs have been subjected to rigorous evaluation. This situation rests as much with the narrowness of most evaluation approaches as with the fuzziness of institutional goals. We are on firmer ground when we deal with the numerical aspects – percent of faculty utilizing performance objectives, or attrition rate of students. If we ignore such aspects as improved committee work, increased colleague interaction, and attitudinal changes, we are overlooking some of the major contributions of a good staff development program. This will remain an uncharted area until the practitioners in the development field begin to document many of the side effects which often go unnoticed in a typical program review.

The majority of development programs are evaluated by the participants in the various activities. Visits by consultants, campus and off-campus workshops, and seminars are rated by participants in terms of benefits received. Such evaluations are necessary to ensure the responsiveness of the staff development effort and to maintain a feeling of ownership on the part of the campus community. But not until the staff development activities directly relate to campus priorities and the *results* of these activities are part of the reward system, performance appraisal, and role expectation, can evaluation of impact take place.

Several community colleges in the SREB Faculty Evaluation Project are attempting to clarify ways of relating faculty development to the evaluation process. When these plans are implemented and the results are reported, they may shed some light on the impact of developmental activities.

Issues and Problems

Most developmental programs during some periods face the hostility of their campus community, since development really means organizational change, and change is viewed with suspicion by segments of most institutions. There are some elements of suspicion that time will break down. Suspicions that can be lived with in September may be viewed as signs of an unhealthy condition if they still exist by June. Many times the confusion is that what is seen as suspicion toward the development program is really a discomfort with change itself.

A factor in alleviating suspicion is the complete separation of development and personnel evaluation. There is the need for the development program to have some "teeth" to it. The "teeth" are not supplied by the development person or group; they come from the organizational goals. It is important that the staff development office be looked upon by other managers as a service and not as a competitor for line office authority. The consistency of support and reward that exists in the relationship between staff development office and management will do a great deal to allay institutional suspicion. If faculty projects are supported with service from the staff development group and reward from the line management, this kind of coordinated help will result in benefits that will make faculty wish to utilize the functions of the staff development office. The faculty member will not be caught, therefore, in a cross-fire between embittered managers and a staff development person who is going off in his/her own direction. The emphasis here is that staff development people do not serve as direction setters or as faculty evaluators, but as resource and support personnel for achieving institutional goals and for fulfilling evaluation requirements. As soon as the staff development office becomes an evaluation or goal-setting instrument, it will lose validity. The "teeth" in a staff development program come from the institutional commitment to the achievement of certain goals as it is reflected in policies, procedures, and the reward system.

This points to the importance of management training as a necessary present and future focus. Administration is responsible for the achievement of organizational goals, the support of instructional and curricular innovation, and the establishment of a fair and equitable reward system. Improved classroom teaching must be accompanied by improved management techniques.

Another major issue is the assigning of a responsibility for the staff development program. Whether responsibility rests with a single individual, an individual with a staff, or a committee, the granting of time to do the work is essential. Allied to the time given an individual or group is the aspect of training. Staff development work is not something that is done as an "overload" or as another committee assignment. It is a time-consuming activity that requires special skills. A lack of understanding of the staff development role can place an awesome burden on the individual or group given this responsibility.

As a development program matures, faculty fatigue can be a problem. Even those who have greeted innovations with enthusiasm will eventually need relief from the tax on their time and energy. This relief doesn't have to be just in the form of released time, but it could be provided in the form of stability and little change. The staff needs an interval for ideas to crystalize and for the security that non-change brings. Workshops are excellent vehicles for promoting interaction and establishing a project, but faculty may be "workshopped to death" beyond a certain point. Institutions as well as individuals need to take a break from the ferment of development and innovation.

Teaching improvement, better management systems, and organizational renewal are all achievable. However, they occur in small increments and one should not look for major, across-the-board changes. Expectations for any development program need to be kept within the realm of reason.

The success of development programs tends to rest far more on institutional commitment than on the nature of program organization. If money, time, resources, and moral support are given to the program, and it is an integral part of college planning and evaluation, then the program tends to endure and succeed. Campus administrators need to involve themselves in the development program and make their commitment known in actions as well as words. In cases where the program has been seen as a fringe activity, a concession to a national fad, or part of a state or grant requirement, the impact has been limited and frequently does not last.

Improving Instruction for Undergraduates

Jeaninne Webb
University of Florida

In the very broadest sense, almost any activity undertaken by an institution of higher education can fall under the rubric of improving instruction. For instance, the renovation or expansion of facilities – teaching laboratories, classrooms, libraries – can be directly related, at least logically, to an improved instructional program. Institutions with heavy emphasis on research and graduate programs are quick to point out that the outcomes of faculty research efforts find their way into the curriculum, upgrading and renewing the information which students acquire. On their list of priorities for improving programs, most departmental chairmen give a high place to the recruitment and development of distinguished faculties, on the firm belief that distinguished faculty produce distinguished programs. Construction programs, funded research, and recruitment of faculty are only three examples of the dozens of activities which can be tied (albeit somewhat tenuously) to instructional improvement for undergraduate education.

It is difficult to isolate specific activities which have the greatest impact on the teaching-learning process. The improvement of undergraduate instruction has not followed a single model within a region or as a national movement, and seldom within a given institution. However, by examining the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) Undergraduate Education Reform (UER) Project and other activities, in and out of the Southern region, certain foci can be identified which have received the most serious attention in the past decade. These foci may serve as guidelines to those who search for ways to improve undergraduate education. These are the focus on the learner, both by way of characteristics and outcomes; the focus on the curriculum and the instructional strategies by which the curriculum is delivered to the learner; and the focus on the faculty, the faculty as teachers and change agents. These are emphases only, since all three factors must be considered ultimately in any comprehensive approach to the design of instruction.

The history of the UER Project supports this statement. An early thrust of the project was to assist institutions in serving non-traditional students and to define more clearly what learners are to learn. An outgrowth of this major effort was the work with faculty and instructional development centers and,

---

Improving instruction for undergraduates is a multi faceted task. In this chapter Jeaninne Webb has proposed that instructional development activity can focus on three aspects – the learner, the curriculum and the faculty. In conducting the work of the Undergraduate Reform Project we have conducted activities which have focused on all three of these areas and, in one sense, we might be described as an instructional development project. Dr. Webb has been involved in many aspects of regional efforts to improve undergraduate instruction. She has participated in a group of directors of centers for faculty and instructional development, she has served as a consultant to institutions participating in various aspects of the project and she has been a committee member of the regional Task Force on Faculty Evaluation and Institutional Rewards. She directs one of the largest instructional development centers in the country, at the University of Florida, and is well known for her competence in instructional development.

finally, the emphasis on faculty evaluation and reward structures. Concurrently with these activities, the project was heavily involved in sponsoring opportunities for faculty and administrators to examine, and experiment with, differing instructional strategies and curricular design. These activities illustrate the primary foci for instructional improvement activities – the learner, the faculty, and the teaching-learning process.

Focus on the Learner

There is a strong tendency for individuals and institutions alike to resist change; institutions of higher education and the faculty which serve them are no different. Centuries of tradition have influenced even the newest of institutions and the youngest of faculty. One has only to watch a commencement exercise and the academic procession of faculty in gowns which have changed little in design since the fifteenth century to be reminded of this. Yet dramatic changes have forced themselves upon postsecondary education in the last two decades, brought about by what has been called the non-traditional learner. Responding to a combination of social and economic forces, postsecondary education is opening its doors to a greater variety of students, in greater numbers, than ever before. The learner over 25 years of age, the underprepared minority student, the vocationally-oriented student – each represents a subpopulation, increasing in size, which has had, and will continue to have, an impact on higher education that cannot be ignored. These students, by their "differentness," have created stresses which have forced institutions to examine and change their instructional programs.

Learner Characteristics

A necessary component of the design of more effective instruction is a more clearly defined student population to be served. Often there is a great uneasiness felt by many faculty because they find that more and more of their students come to them less and less prepared than in the past, or less motivated to acquire the information they offer. Procedures can be developed, however, to discover just how these students differ from the expectations which faculty hold for them. The most obvious problem which faculty identify is the lack of basic skills in reading, writing, and mathematics. Many institutions, particularly those with open admission or special admission policies, have developed careful assessment procedures which identify the achievement level of entering students in the basic skills areas and have designed remedial or developmental programs to help students overcome these deficiencies.

On the reverse side of the coin, although not as often causing faculty concern and debate, is the mature learner who brings with him or her skills and knowledge acquired in other, non-college settings. In seeking ways to assess and grant credit for these experiences, two major thrusts have occurred. One, the credit-by-examination programs offered by national testing services have grown dramatically in the past 10 years. The state of Florida grants thousands of hours of credit to students each year through the College Level Examination Program offered by the College Entrance Examination Board and the Educational Testing Service. The American College Testing program also provides tests in subject matter areas which permit students to substantiate their prior learning. The other thrust, spearheaded by the Council for the Advancement of Experiential Learning (originally the Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning Project) has been to develop procedures through which prior learning or concurrent learning in a non-college setting can be documented by the learner and faculty, with credit awarded by the receiving institution.

Not only do these learners bring with them experiences and skills different from the traditional entering student, they also often bring the responsibilities of caring for and supporting families. Some are in mid-career, seeking to upgrade employment opportunities or make career changes. Women, wishing to enter or return to the labor market, often with heavy child care responsibilities, are also seeking access to higher education. Many of these learners are place-bound and cannot become full-time, residential students. As a result, there has been a strong interest, both regionally and nationally, in serving these students through external degree programs. The UEB Project actively assisted institutions in these areas through its work with the Alabama Consortium for the Development of Higher Education, the New College of the University of Alabama, and Florida International University.

Remedial or developmental, credit-by-examination, and external degree programs have been developed, at least in part, to respond to the differing characteristics of new learners. One of the most interesting outcomes of these innovations has been that many of the so-called traditional students -- the 18- to 21-year-old, educationally prepared students -- are taking advantage of the programs. They enroll in developmental programs to upgrade skills, seek credit-by-examination, and earn credit in external degree programs. Instructionally sound programs often effectively serve others besides the target populations for which they were designed.

Learner Outcomes

Some institutions and faculty have focused on describing the outcomes of their educational programs, defining what learners are to learn or how the learners should behave after they have completed a course of instruction, as the first step in designing an improved instructional program. By initially defining outcomes and methods of assessing those outcomes, it becomes much easier to design the curricula and instructional procedures to help students arrive at these predetermined goals. Also, with clearly specified objectives and carefully designed procedures and standards for assessing the learner's progress, an instructional program can be more effectively evaluated. Certainly a strong argument for focusing on learner outcomes is the accountability factor. Rising costs of higher education and disenchantment by some with the perceived values of postsecondary education have convinced many legislators, taxpayers and educators that there must be some quality control on the outcomes of education -- student learning.

The most ambitious attempts to define learner outcomes have been the competency-based education projects undertaken by entire institutions or colleges within institutions. These projects have focused on defining the outcomes or competencies which a student should attain at the baccalaureate level, and then designing curricula which will enable the student to acquire these competencies. The UER Project was heavily involved in this area; the work is fully described elsewhere in this report.

An activity which is more limited in scope, but more widespread, has occurred at the course or program level. Individual faculty, or a group of faculty within a department, have found that designing more effective measures of student achievement can be an initial step in the improvement of a course or series of courses. Rather than struggling to develop competency statements or even course objectives described in performance terms, many faculty find it more productive to focus on the examinations they construct to test and evaluate student learning. An effective technique which the UER Project used, and which has been duplicated elsewhere, was the workshop held for faculty representatives of 13 predominantly black colleges on the testing issue. Emphasis on improving teacher-made tests as well as interpreting standardized test scores led to discussions on using test results to make curriculum changes and developing instructional procedures to help students improve their performance on tests. In addition to this workshop which focused on measurement procedures, other regional workshops gave attention to testing and grading procedures. By helping faculty to improve testing procedures, the process for instructional improvement can be instigated. An analysis of test items often leads to changes in current content or emphasis, and experimentation with more effective or desirable ways to present that content to students.

One of the most positive results of focusing instructional improvement on the learner is that it helps foster more positive faculty attitudes toward the students they teach. Rather than spotlighting the teacher and his or her behavior in the classroom or the content of the discipline, the emphasis is placed upon the student: 1) what he/she is like; 2) what his/her needs are; 3) what should be the outcomes of the instructional program for him/her; and 4) what competencies he/she should possess as the result of earning a baccalaureate degree.

Focus on Learning: Content and Process

Undergraduate instruction consists of the curriculum, the content of the discipline, and the process by which that content is made available to the learner. Traditionally, the faculty role has been to choose the content and make it available to students through lecturing, the assignment of reading in textbooks and

related materials, and often, classroom recitation and discussion. This role continues to be the primary one played by most faculty. It is a rare postsecondary institution in which most of the teaching of most faculty does not fall within this format. So closely are these activities associated that it is difficult, if at all possible, to separate the content from the process. Although one may theoretically describe and analyze various instructional strategies separately from the curriculum, in reality most faculty are neither comfortable with such an artificial separation nor do they believe it is a productive thing to do. The staff of the UER Project recognized this from the beginning; thus, their work, as that of others, has emphasized a discipline-based approach to the examination of alternative teaching strategies.

Instructional Strategies

The heterogeneity of today's student populations, and increasing faculty sensitivity to the fact that students differ in both rate and style of learning, has given impetus to a search for more effective ways to help students meet curriculum goals. Perhaps the greatest emphasis in the development of alternatives to the lecture/recitation format has been on attempts to individualize instruction. Leaders in this area have been Fred Keller, a psychologist who developed an instructional system which has come to be known as the Personalized System of Instruction (PSI); and Sam Postlethwait, a biologist at Purdue, whose auto-tutorial methods of teaching undergraduate biology have gained national attention.

The instructional systems developed by these teachers have been adapted and adopted in many institutions and in a variety of disciplines. The strengths of these innovative instructional procedures are that they allow for wide variation of content and implementation in many settings. One may find PSI and auto-tutorial procedures used in the humanities and social sciences, as well as the behavioral and natural sciences; in courses which enroll 20 students or 2,000 students; and in institutions which have total enrollments ranging from 500 to 45,000. As faculty have examined and implemented these approaches to instruction, they have discovered that components of the techniques can be varied, enlarged upon, or even eliminated. Thus, an instructional system may include self-instruction without self-pacing, or peer-tutoring without multiple testing procedures.

One of the major efforts of the UER Project over the past six years has been to encourage faculty in the region to examine, learn about, and possibly adopt procedures which increase the individualization of the courses they teach. Early in the project, a workshop in San Antonio provided sessions on innovative instructional approaches which included the use of PSI techniques in English composition, modular instruction, and gaming and simulation techniques. In workshops in Tennessee and Florida, new approaches to individualizing teaching and learning in specific disciplinary areas were presented by faculty who were successfully using these techniques in their own instruction. Faculty from the region served as leaders in three workshops held for faculty in Georgia colleges and reported on their efforts to develop new approaches in their own teaching by demonstrating the instructional process through use of the subject matter of their own discipline. Throughout the history of the UER Project, hundreds of faculty in the region have had opportunities to study instructional strategies which will enable them to respond to the differing learning rates and styles of their students.

The individualization of instruction through self-instruction, self-pacing, peer-teaching, the construction of instructional modules, programmed instruction, and computer-assisted instruction is being implemented in a variety of educational settings to better facilitate the student in the learning process.

Curricular Design

By slightly shifting the focus from process to content, one can also begin improving instruction by examining the curriculum in terms of what should be taught, in what sequence, in what depth, and in what breadth. The right to design curriculum has been a keenly felt responsibility for faculty, related to the issue of academic freedom. Yet many curriculum decisions go beyond the selection of content for a single course or program. In the Sixties a primary question for curriculum design was that of relevance. The demands from students that the undergraduate curriculum reflect the issues and problems of the times resulted in several types of changes. For example, programs in black studies was developed, the study of motion picture film as a literary genre became popular, and the requirement of the study of a foreign language as a baccalaureate degree requirement became less prevalent. Today, the issues are reflected in

the questions of vocational as opposed to liberal education, and what role each should play in the curriculum. General education has been defined and redefined but a question which many faculty are attempting to resolve is how it fits into the sequence of the curriculum prior to or concurrently with professional or technical education courses.

Providing a forum for the examination of curriculum content, whether at the course, program, or institutional level, is a valuable activity for the improvement of instructional programs. Not only must faculty insure that the most current and accurate information available within their disciplines be taught, but also that the content contribute in the best way to the total education of the students they teach. One useful method which the UER Project has used to provide this forum is the work with disciplinary groups. Activities for faculty to become involved in curriculum design (for example, setting curriculum goals and objectives, as well as developing appropriate instructional strategies) have been sponsored by the project in the disciplines of speech, political science, and history. Focusing on curriculum design and instructional procedures is a useful approach to instructional improvement at the undergraduate level.

Focus on the Faculty

The key to instructional change and improvement is the faculty. Faculty are primarily responsible for the quality of the instruction students receive and if they 1) hold positive attitudes about the capability of students, 2) are open to change and seek better ways to help students learn, 3) are skilled in teaching techniques and are competent both in the classroom and in their content areas, and 4) believe their teaching efforts will be rewarded, sound and exciting instructional programs can be assured. For this reason, many of the efforts to improve instruction over the past decade have been in the area of faculty development. Programs designed to help faculty stay abreast in their disciplines through sabbatical leaves have been time-honored means of faculty development. The more recent emphasis has been on helping faculty perform more adequately in their teaching roles through programs which will increase their instructional skills, provide them with better evaluation systems, and improve the incentive and reward structure of their institutions. Three other papers in this report deal with these key areas – progress for faculty development, staff development in community colleges, and faculty evaluation and reward structures – illustrating the importance of faculty in improving undergraduate education.

Focus on the Future

Predicting the issues and trends of the future is a difficult task and one which provides a large margin for error. However, a declining population of 18- to 21-year olds – the traditional college-bound student – has been well-documented and the information widely disseminated. As a result of this trend, certain predictions can be made.

If many of our institutions of higher education are to survive, they must increasingly look to the adult learner as a potential student. External degree programs, credit-by-examination, and the use of educational technology are features of current programs which will undergo continued expansion. The increasing costs of higher education will reduce the number of students who can afford a four-year residential education. An emphasis on delivery of instruction to students in their homes or places of work will be a trend of the future. New alliances between higher education and industry will be created. Already many large corporations have developed highly sophisticated instructional programs for their personnel. The next step will be arrangements in which corporations and colleges share responsibilities for providing both degree and non-degree programs to adult learners.

Programs for foreign students, particularly of a technical nature, will increase. State universities may well find their extension divisions reaching beyond the state they serve to become international in scope. There will be an increased emphasis on developing effective programs for teaching English as a second language as well as basic skills in reading and writing.

Lastly, there may be a renewed interest in the liberal arts and increased activity in interdisciplinary curriculum design. The role of the humanities and social sciences in the education of scientists, engineers, teachers, physicians, and lawyers has yet to be fully defined. There will be a continuing interest in the individualization of instruction as postsecondary education strives for effective ways to serve a new student population with diverse needs.

Faculty Evaluation and Institutional Rewards

John M. Bevan
College of Charleston

My first encounter with faculty evaluation occurred in the spring of 1954 when it was rumored about campus that faculty members had been "rated." Being by nature both curious and suspicious, I went in to the dean to inquire about the mythical scale and where on it my accumulated merits had registered. His response was a bit baffling. "Four point six", he said, " on a scale where 'one' isn't complimentary and 'five' is a level of performance beyond which there is no better." "What does '4.6' mean?", I asked. He couldn't answer that question directly, but he did inform me that 10 of my senior colleagues, whose identity would remain anonymous, were asked to rate all other faculty members on a scale of 1 to 5. My score was an average of the 10 raters' estimates. It was a sort of "holistic" approach in that this one rating on this continuum represented the summation of my teaching qualities, scholarly contributions, and community services. When I pressed again for an interpretation of "4.6", or for an elaboration of my strengths and weaknesses, the dean quietly reaffirmed his earlier contention that only those who made the actual judgments could answer my specific questions, and his pledge to anonymity prevented him from directing me to them. He did make a final statement to the effect that had my rating been at the lower end of the scale, I would have had something to worry about. This was a most interesting comment because no one had asked to see my student ratings, or a sample of my publications, or a record of my professional developments, or a listing of my community contributions and activities. Even more interesting as I look back on the incident, I don't remember being disturbed enough to pursue the matter. There were no hints of persons given termination notices or called in for critical reviews. The vast majority of my colleagues didn't know their ratings and apparently didn't care to know.

In 1954, no one seemed too concerned about faculty evaluation, or how one might relate such a process to the critical decisions of promotion, tenure or dismissal. Annual raises weren't large enough to boast of a sizable merit increase, and positions elsewhere were plentiful. Furthermore, it was assumed that matured professional development came with the Ph.D. degree; teaching and research were indulged as habits and, as is true to habits, all that was required for growth was regular feeding. Rank came with time, as did pay and privilege increases. Worldly rewards weren't the greatest, but the psychological reinforcements were deemed sufficient for anyone who looked forward to being stimulated regularly in an atmosphere of alacrity, inquiry, and intellectual repose.

In this chapter John M. Bevan calls on administrators and faculty leaders to come up with creative approaches to rewarding faculty for carrying out their regular duties and for maintaining continual emphasis on their professional development. Dr. Bevan is Vice President for Academic Affairs at the College of Charleston in South Carolina, and has served as Academic Dean and Vice President in several other institutions. He is well known for emphasizing quality of work in the development of innovative approaches. He has been an active participant in Undergraduate Education Reform Project activities since the project began. He has been an informal advisor to the staff, has served on several committees, and has been a workshop leader and consultant for faculty evaluation activities.

In 1979, the situation is different and there is little need to elaborate the factors contributing to the change. Suffice it to say, those in academe do not take nearly as much for granted as once they did, and they have become more aware of how and where evaluation fits into the scheme of academic affairs.

Purposes of Faculty Evaluation

It is agreed generally that at the time faculty members complete their advanced degrees and take a teaching position, they are only beginning the career-long process of becoming fully competent professional teachers, advisors, evaluators, committee workers, educational philosophers, and researchers. New faculty need guidance to develop the skills essential to carrying out these critical responsibilities effectively, because not knowing how to perform well prevents career satisfaction. Furthermore, there is a continual need to improve courses, to understand new approaches and techniques, to assimilate and teach new knowledge, and to grow personally. This is the unending process of retooling, recharging, refining, and extending professional development while, at the same time, deriving the self-satisfaction and self-insight necessary to sustain good morale as effective mentors. What better way to serve institutional goals and to improve instruction than through the personal and professional growth of faculty?

In addition, it is recognized that *faculty evaluation* can be an important aspect of *faculty development*, since such evaluation can reinforce personal growth and instructional improvement throughout a faculty member's career. In one sense, the primary goals of faculty evaluation are identical to those of faculty development, i.e., the improvement of college teaching and the improvement of student learning. In a broader sense, such evaluation means guiding the growth of faculty members as persons embodying the qualities which a college or university seeks to cultivate. When appropriately used, the information derived from evaluation can be most valuable in the propagation of faculty development.

Faculty members are a college's or university's primary resource for stimulating learning and the central force in maintaining and enhancing its character, vitality, and outreach. Therefore, ongoing programs of faculty development and faculty evaluation should be of highest priority in every institution of higher learning, and leadership must be exhorted to establish more appropriate rewards to reinforce these programs. (*1, pp. 106-7*)

Before exploring rewards related to evaluation, development, and renewal of faculty, or seeking to exhort leadership to introduce innovation into such efforts, there are several points that should be made.

- **Faculty development and faculty evaluation are conjoined, but are seen usually as processes which somehow should be kept separate because of the fear or threat of one for the other, i.e., of evaluation for development.**

  In the minds of many college professors the ends of evaluation are perceived as punitive and an infringement to privacy. Admittedly, this is a strange posture for persons who daily devote their time to developing critical skills and forming thought and judgment in others, who regularly and systematically gauge the progress of these evolving processes, and who regard constructive judgment as a mark of a professional academician.

  Without a doubt, the manner in which faculty evaluation is introduced has most frequently left much to be desired and has elicited anxiety and suspicion which can't be dismissed as mere figments of inflamed imagination; case after case supports abuse inflicted by peers and patriarchs. More than likely, however, it is the absence in the academic setting of a process regularly scheduled, systematically defined, seriously pursued, and appropriately reinforced which leads to feelings of apprehension. When evaluation is scheduled at intervals as infrequent as tenure and promotion reviews, is staged as a chit-chat session between the dean and president, and has outcomes so far reaching as to be career eclipsing, then fear and antagonism can be expected.

  However, when seen and used primarily in a formative way, designed to identify and develop talent, evaluation is personally supportive and a stimulus to growth. Also, it is institutionally supportable because the objective of any administration is to identify faculty talent as early as possible, to feed it, then to rally those with it by judiciously exploiting their highest potential.

- **Department chairpersons are the key to effective evaluation, and most of them only suspect this is true.**

  Chairpersons spend an inordinate amount of time seeing to it that departmental supplies are replenished, class schedules arranged, staff replacements employed, and equipment ordered, but find very few moments for sitting with a colleague to discuss his or her teaching, to inquire about research, or to pass on a compliment for a committee assignment well-executed. The most important responsibility, that of monitoring the development of a colleague and keeping that colleague informed, seems to be the one regularly neglected. The process essential to formative development tends to be avoided even when criteria have been carefully elaborated, student ratings and colleague letters gathered, and all kinds of other evidence assembled and made available.

  Why is it so difficult to sit down with a colleague to review his or her performance and take advantage of the opportunity evaluation affords to assist in his or her development? Presumably, there are as many answers to this question as there are chairpersons. What is important is that such interview sessions take place regularly, particularly with those faculty members whose careers are beginning and who need direct and honest feedback. The story can be told over and over again of persons coming up for tenure and being made aware for the first time in a five- or six-year probationary period that performance did not meet "the level of expectancy in the department" or "the level of quality set by the institution." Letters which concisely and summarily state that "it is in the best interest of the institution your contract not be renewed" are cold and shattering. If formative counseling were an every semester or every year experience, carefully and ceremoniously pursued by every department chairperson, there would be much less need for such capsuled communiques, and chances for better instruction and better programs would improve. *Workshops to train department chairpersons in faculty evaluation are sorely needed.*

- **Considering the criteria used in judging faculty, particularly in the liberal arts, a new perception of faculty by faculty is necessary.**

  There is a need for faculty to be seen as members of a resource pool, which is a view in contrast to the one held in the conventional disciplinary setting where basic instruction is provided by specialists and supported by the proposition that only major students who have gone far enough up the incline can profit from work with a specialist. This conventional process produces a profusion of courses and departments based on separate disciplines with rather static structures, wherein conversation is limited mostly to disciplinary discourse and whereby the institution is reduced to the sum total of its separate parts. It follows, also, that frequently, new ideas are resisted or lost in political harassment and maneuvering, and creative projects of an interdisciplinary nature are discouraged or underfunded. In contrast, the resource pool concept presents a faculty member as a source and not as someone who fills a special slot only. It's primary assumption is, for example, that the geneticist grows out of the biologist, grows out of the scientist, grows out of the total human being. Translated into the liberal learning context of what it means to be a scientist-artist-scholar human being, it provides rich and diverse opportunities for the learning of specialized knowledge and skills, but not at the expense of learning the skills of being a human being.

  The general change agent for this view is a specialist who can see ways of relating his knowledge, skills, and expertise as a whole human being to the skills, knowledge, and expertise of other human beings from different disciplines. He and she can relate and interrelate, and out of this interchange come new conversations and formulations – dynamic growth. The specialist's contribution is never ignored, nor is full access to his research and teaching within his specialty denied him. What is expected is a contribution coherent with the conception of the university as a community enterprise directed by a philosophy of unity. The basic issue of the contrasting positions isn't focused between the generalist and the specialist, but between conflicting models of human development. (*2, pp. 33-41*)

  Yeats' description of the artist and his community is dolorously appropos to the contemporary university scene:

  > The artist gets into a world of ideas pure and simple when he has lived for a long time in his own mind with the example of other artists as deliberate as himself. He becomes very highly individualized and at last by sheer pursuit of perfection

> becomes sterile . . . and in his community you don't find what other writers used to call the people; you find instead a few highly cultivated, highly perfected individual lives, and great multitudes who imitate them and cheapen them. You find, too, . . . an impulse toward creation which grows gradually weaker and weaker. (*4, p. 107*)

Changing our perspective in the direction suggested is important because evaluation is becoming less narrowly defined, as attempts to correlate departmental goals with institutional goals increase. It appears that the lives of the learned are expected to show how knowledge is related to wisdom and that learning does enhance humanity, i.e., how the quality of education is correlated with the quality of life.

- **Faculty evaluation requires a commitment of money and energy.**

  It's customary to think of evaluation costs in terms of expenditures for student rating forms, computer scanning, printouts and the like. Now, however, with evaluation's emphasis on diagnostic and developmental factors, the expectancy exists that greater expenditures in money and effort will be made by an institution to create opportunities for correcting weaknesses and for reinforcing strengths.

  It has become clear that faculty evaluation ought not to be endorsed or implemented if there is little or no intent to support developmental efforts. Succinctly stated, faculty evaluation without funding for faculty development is most likely to be regarded as threatening and ineffectual and the degree of emotional charge inversely related to the amount of time that deans and chairpersons spend in personal assistance. It is incomprehensible that administrators of institutions with ten-, twenty- or thirty-million-dollar budgets could be comfortable with $2,000, $5,000 or $10,000 as their institution's annual appropriation for faculty evaluation and development. The cost in dollars should approach 1 percent of the operations budget; the cost in time of assistance varies from chairperson to chairperson and is experienced often in terms of colleague interruptions, patience, perseverence and sometimes disappointment.

Creating New Rewards for Faculty

It is not too surprising that few incentives have been introduced to encourage continued development, renewal, and evaluation of faculty. The rewards as catalogued are promotion, tenure, modest salary increments, teaching load reductions, and occasionally a distinguished chair. After tenure has been received, very little beyond promotion to the rank of full professor can be expected, except the final gesture of "professor emeritus." Maybe there's an "Outstanding Teacher Award" or an "Outstanding Research Award" along the way, but these are not specific attainments faculty members strive for or request. Somewhere we've lost sight of faculty as a group of very different individuals needing varieties of incentives and opportunities to stimulate and extend potential. Faculty evaluation repeatedly substantiates this judgment, yet the reward response to it is standard and somewhat sterile. With the encroachment of the "steady state" status it becomes imperative that new approaches to reward be explored – approaches which are less summative in character and more reinforcing in a dynamic process. A few suggestions are offered.

In-House Visiting Lecturers

During an interview with her dean, an associate professor in art history mentioned she would be interested in serving as a resource person to colleagues, i.e., entertaining invitations to lecture in colleagues' classes where her expertise could be used. Following an extended discussion of these suggestions, the young professor was given a one course load reduction for the fall and spring semesters and her appointment as an in-house visiting lecturer was announced to her colleagues. By the middle of the next summer, her fall program was scheduled with lectures, such as "Scientific Concepts of the Modern World as Reflected in Art" (Introduction to Biology), "Man's Visualization of His Gods" (History of Religion), "The Interaction of Mind-Eye Patterns" (General Psychology), "Transformation of Medieval to Renaissance as seen in Visual Art" (History of Western Europe), "Concepts of Baroque Style" (Baroque Music).

Requests to lecture were followed always by a conversation with the respective colleagues to determine objectives and purposes for the presentation. Also, conversations were held after lectures and requests for additional lectures were frequent. Both colleagues and lecturer reported great satisfaction and a desire to continue the arrangement because of its implications for strengthening interdisciplinary studies. As a result, consideration is now being given to designating, on a three-year rotating basis, one visiting lecturer from each of the four academic divisions. Such an appointment, regarded as prestigious, stresses the importance of faculty members as resource persons and provides satisfactions supportive of dynamic development.

Seminar for Faculty—A Trainer Resource

In writing to his department chairperson, one faculty member stated,

> I would like to see selected faculty members teach 25 percent fewer courses over a designated period of years and use the available time to improve the quality of the institution in other ways. For example, a faculty member could conduct a year-long seminar that would be of interest to colleagues and students in his or her own and related departments. He or she could act as a mentor to colleagues interested in learning more and possibly doing research involving his or her field.

The department to which this faculty member belongs had been responsible for introducing a mini-computer to the campus and for offering a two-semester seminar in computer languages to 18 faculty members from eight disciplines. Because of the extensive use faculty and students are making of them, 15 terminals and disc storage capacity are now inadequate. In such an undertaking, the faculty members who are involved derive a sense of their importance to the development of their colleagues, their department, and their institution.

Master Teachers

One of the fascinating contradictions in academe is the practice of reducing a professor's teaching load as a reward for good teaching. An outstanding teacher is relieved of courses in order to do research, when it would seem more appropriate to reduce teaching activities to make more of the person's time available to others who might benefit and learn from his or her supervision in perfecting approaches to instruction. Such a person could be designated as a Master Teacher, given a three-year, 11-month contract with a one-course load reduction each semester. Summer would provide opportunities to update teaching, prepare seminars for faculty, and be a resource person to colleagues in matters pertaining to the philosophy and improvement of teaching. The Master Teacher could work individually, or with others similarly designated, presenting seminars or lectures to interested colleagues, conducting mentor training sessions, and being available generally for observation and discussion. These Master Teachers would represent a core of faculty concerned about good teaching and the correlation of academic programs to institutional objectives.

Distinguished Research Professors

These individuals would be so designated because of their recognized accomplishments in research, their knowledge of funding sources for research, their enthusiasm for and encouragement of scholarly pursuits, and their willingness to assist colleagues in designing and preparing research proposals. One such person could be chosen from each of the academic divisions, and contracts similar to those of Master Teachers arranged. These persons would not replace the staff officers responsible for providing support services for research efforts, but would supplement their services, including providing assistance with research planned to study outcomes of new instructional approaches. Of course, if a director of research is not available, then these faculty may help fill that void.

It should be recognized that Distinguished Research Professors would not go about campus checking to see whether colleagues are doing research. They would be available to encourage and aid faculty who express an interest in research, e.g., running interference for those trying to secure research space, finding seed money for pilot studies, or obtaining a reduction in teaching load for others needing time for writing. As well as being resource persons on campus, they serve as scholar examples.

Mini-Grants

Mini-grants can be an important means of maintaining and enhancing personal growth and a source for professional and instructional improvement. It's surprising how such grants can enhance educational climate, help shape the faculty as a dynamic resource pool, stimulate attention to the skills of teaching, and provide the transition from minimal scholarly pursuits to mature scholarship. Excerpts from the regular annual report of a physics department exemplify the role of such grants as well as the dynamics of the resource pool concept mentioned earlier.

> One faculty member, aided by a mini-grant, attended a Department of Energy-funded education workshop and is helping to develop, through the Center for Metropolitan Affairs and Public Policy, a grant proposal which includes a city/college energy conservation program. When funded, this proposal will also provide undergraduate research opportunities. Another faculty member will conduct seminars on teaching for the department and other interested colleagues to pass on what he learned from his contacts with a nationally known teacher during three weeks sponsored by the college mini-grant. Tentative plans are being made to turn a room in the science building into a learning center. The room will include individual study areas, a mini-computer terminal, space for long-term lab projects, and a testing area for a self-paced course. . . . In addition, we will continue to be active participants in campus faculty development activities and off-campus professional conferences and workshops. We feel that these activities will lead to improvement in the overall scholarship and learning climate at the college. (*3, pp. 59-67*)

In an academic setting of this kind, faculty members have the opportunity to work without fear or threat, because the focus is on assisting each other; constructive evaluation of colleagues and programs is an everyday happening, out of which ideas are generated and spread. As one of my associates so aptly put it: "Not only do grants beget grants, but planning new ideas in one area seems to generate ideas in others." (*3, p. 67*)

Internal Sabbaticals

Sabbaticals are typically available after each six years of full-time service, with full salary provided for one semester or half salary for two semesters. Under this scheme, the average faculty member winds up taking advantage of one sabbatical in three due to inconvenience, cost, unpreparedness, or inability to "break" the routine. Yet, sabbaticals are designed to function as "growth" periods. This being the case, they should be more frequent and "implanted" into the scheme of routine. For instance, if every eighth consecutive semester a faculty member were free of regular responsibilities to engage in research, writing, and study according to an agreed-upon plan, and if everyone in every department were scheduled similarly but in a rotating arrangement, a creative dynamic atmosphere might ensue.

The mechanics are rather simple: a faculty member is not scheduled to teach during the eighth semester and no replacement is employed. Course schedules are published for a two-year period to allow majors to arrange required courses well in advance, assuming that all required courses are offered within any two-year period. Within this scheme sabbaticals would occur in a younger faculty member's career immediately following the critical third year evaluation and in time to define a program which might take into consideration pertinent observations and recommendations. A second sabbatical would follow closely the critical tenure decision. In fact, it would not be difficult to arrange subsequent summative reviews to coincide with regularly scheduled "growth" leaves.

Many within and outside of academe will look on such a scheme as "featherbedding." When one-eighth of a staff is free every semester, even though it is to engage in activities which enhance the institution's thrust, the inevitable conclusion will be drawn that funds are being wasted in overstaffing. This is unfortunate because such a program is needed to maintain vitality during a steady state period when little new blood gets into the system. It is a reward format and at the same time a prescribed antidote to the lethargy which routine inflicts on academe.

Banking Credits

In a few colleges, course credit overloads or hours credited for directing independent study are "banked," and when the equivalent to a semester's load has been accumulated (usually within a designated time period, such as three years), the holder of the "banked" credits is entitled to a semester's leave for study and research. Likewise, an overload in one semester may mean an equivalent load reduction in the next semester. Through this means, faculty members may secure time for writing, for working up new courses, for doing research to improve classroom instruction, for spending additional time with students in independent study. Banking time for creative ventures (time to be creative) is based on dollars earned from tuition paid for hours taught and for which no extra compensation was paid.

After-Tenure Rewards

For all intents and purposes, formal evaluation ends when tenure begins. It appears to be assumed that the level of accepted competence attained in the six-year probationary period will be maintained and enhanced. Furthermore, it appears that the reward systems within academe were defined to reinforce efforts during the period of probation primarily, because after tenure the only remaining plus most faculty might expect is promotion to professor or the distinction of holding a departmental chair reserved for the exceptional few.

So much more in the way of creativity and production may result from post-tenure evaluation scheduled at six-year intervals, and an added salary increment might be the reward for significant and continued development after each such evaluation. If this added increment were as much as $1500, the total increase in salary over a career could be very substantial. Too, other rewards limited to tenured professors should make a difference, e.g., partial support for study abroad or opportunity to participate in certain internships and exchange programs.

After Retirement— Professors Emeriti

The assignment of professors emeriti to the library can broaden the intellectual offerings of the library by identifying learned and experienced men as consultants and by making available library resources to which students might not otherwise have access.

A job description for a "Coordinator of Library Resources" in one college included the following:

> . . . would supervise the work of three to five professors emeriti and librarians emeriti of the college. The emeriti would be given office space in the library and would work in close conjunction with the Coordinator of Library Resources . . . .

In this program the talents and experience of professors emeriti who become members of the reference staff are utilized to support students in their special projects, in tutorials, and in independent study. They provide assistance also to the regular faculty and are expected to be familiar not only with library resources at the college, but also with those of the libraries of the region. They advise students concerning library resources and the special skills and interests of college personnel. They provide the usual advice, guidance, encouragement, and evaluation for as many student projects as their abilities and activities allow. When feasible and appropriate, the emeriti accompany students to libraries and research centers of neighboring institutions.

The professors emeriti in the library can open many doors which the professor in the classroom can refer to only by way of recommendation. Students have a resource, and aging faculty have a continuously rewarding outlet. Too, such professors augment their retirement income in an amount up to the social security allowance, or according to the salary differential of the professor at the time of retirement and that paid his or her young replacement. An annual informal evaluation determines future assignments to students. (*2, p. 40*)

Little Things

These "little things" not only give satisfaction, they contribute to growth. A professor writes an article and is surprised and pleased when a colleague comments on its content, and when the dean sends a note indicating appreciation and the desire to discuss the thesis and conclusions put forth. Or, a professor derives benefits from critical reactions to the results reported on a new instructional approach introduced

into a course. Or, reinforcement is received when a student or colleague expresses "thanks" for assistance in arriving at a critical decision. Or, one receives support when told that every lecture is better than the last. The most meaningful comment a colleague made to me early in my career was to the effect that had he been giving my lecture, he could have done a much better job in getting my points across. The 30-minute conversation which followed introduced me to many of the subtleties about formal presentations and how to monitor student reactions when lecturing. It's important to remember that both positive and negative recognition is more effective for learning than no recognition at all. Too, never enough in the way of little things is said between colleagues, when frequently these little comments, if straightforward and sincere, best serve to help a colleague know how he or she stands.

In conclusion:

- Faculty evaluation is an important aspect of faculty development because evaluation reinforces personal growth and instructional improvement throughout a faculty member's career.
- The primary goals of faculty evaluation are identical to those of faculty development, i.e., the improvement of college teaching and the improvement of student learning.
- Because faculty members are a college's or university's primary resource for stimulating learning and the central force in maintaining and enhancing its character and vitality, programs of faculty evaluation and faculty development should be of highest priority and appropriate reward systems should be established to reinforce them.

REFERENCES

1. Bevan, John M., "Faculty Development." Paper presented at Estes Park Dean's Workshop, June 1974, cited in Gaff's *Toward Faculty Renewal*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975, pp. 106-7.
2. Bevan, John M., "Faculty Resource Pool: Mark of an Innovative Institution." *North Carolina Libraries*, Vol. 35, 1978, pp. 33-41.
3. Morgan, George A., "Using Grants for Faculty Development." *Grants: Views From the Campus*, edited by Kathryn Mohrmann and published by the Association of American Colleges, 1979, pp. 59-67.
4. Yeats manuscript first published by Richard Ellmann. See his *James Joyce*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959, p. 107.

Developing Strategies and Building Resources For Change

Throughout the entire history of the project, two related aspects of work have held nearly equal importance with the development of new programs and improved teaching methods. A great deal of attention has been paid to designing or adapting *strategies* appropriate to accomplishing the various goals and to determining the best ways to aid in the *development of the individuals* who participated in project activities.

Strategies

Linking People for Regional Sharing

Since our first conceptualization of this plan for reform in undergraduate education, we have thought that serving as a clearinghouse on innovations and new directions for our constituents was one of the major responsibilities. Our approach to fulfilling this function has been far more comprehensive, however, than just responding to requests for information and disseminating what we thought important; all of our activities have been designed to "link" people for mutual benefit. We have worked to connect persons with similar ideas and to link people who had special experience with others who needed that information from those experiences. While this linking process was essentially intuitive at the beginning, we gradually became more conscious of this approach as a major strategy for change in the region. We were always on the lookout for innovations and for innovators whom we could then connect to others. Our workshops, personal contacts, and consultations have focused primarily on providing further information to those who indicated an interest in a topic so that they might be persuaded to try out new approaches.

Another way in which we have handled this linking function, has been to develop small groups to work on ideas and new approaches and develop those ideas to a point where we could demonstrate to others how they might work. The original competency work group was an example of this effort. We collected a small number of people who had some experience and particular interest in the competency concept. We had them work for a year to more clearly identify what would be useful for others to know. Then we held a conference which described the current state of the concept and its implementation. This provided to people with an interest in that concept help in clarifying their goals and needs and encouragement to adopt this particular innovation if appropriate. There seemed no better way to influence someone to think about a new idea in which interest had been expressed than to have someone who was already involved in the approach describe and demonstrate his or her own enthusiasm and successes.

Participants in the project have frequently commented that this connecting approach to providing information was very helpful to them. Indeed, for many, this may have been the most important function we served. One participant put it this way:

> The greatest impact, it seems to me, has been in the project's providing our institution with a point of contact, or clearinghouse, if you please, for seeking information on matters related to undergraduate curriculum reform. On numerous occasions over the past several years I have referred people to the SREB offices for information. I see, from time to time,

consultants on our campus, whom we initially identified through contacts made at workshops and conferences sponsored by the project.

Action Teams

Probably the second most frequently used technique or strategy has been the development of campus action teams to address needs or issues with which we were working. Our interest in this concept was built upon the experiences of Sykes, Smallwood and Schlesinger, as reported in their book, *Renewing Higher Education From Within*, published by Jossey-Bass. Early in the project we decided this would be an effective mechanism for bringing about change on a campus and we developed activities which used teams for work on planning for staff development, revising faculty evaluation systems, and improving the testing of students. The important aspects of this team concept are 1) the team represents an institution, 2) it is focused entirely on a single task, and 3) the roles of the team members are defined around the needs for accomplishing the task. The positions held by the members of the team in their day-to-day activities do not necessarily hold in the team relationship and the tasks can be divided according to the talents and abilities of the team members. Perhaps the most important characteristic is that the team has a specific focus, a set of goals, and a specified time-frame in which to work.

Aspects of the team concept have been used in all of our regionwide or multi-institutional workshops and conferences. We usually insisted that more than one person from an institution attend and, at most events, some time was set aside for those from the same institution to work together on plans for action back home. It was fairly routine also for us to expect the representatives from an institution to leave a written statement, or action plan, for their next steps. It seems unlikely that having just one representative from an institution attend a conference will lead to significant accomplishments back on the campus, if that is the major purpose of a conference.

The team idea generally met with very positive responses and we found persons who participated in this approach picking up the idea to be used in other places. A note from one team member in the project illustrates this point:

> I have enjoyed participating in this team design. As a dean, I am using this strategy internally in my school on a number of projects. . . . It is a useful experience for me to participate in this project, as it reinforces and expands my understanding of teams.

Multi-Institutional Activities

After the first year of the project, when we held a major regional conference for representatives from many institutions, we seldom held regionwide conferences. We concluded that we could reach a larger number of people and be more effective in encouraging the adoption of new approaches through conferences or workshops that served a smaller geographic area than the entire 14-state SREB region.

For the remainder of the project, meetings were held for statewide groups of faculty members, for faculty from systems within a state, and for consortia of institutions in the same geographical area. In two or three instances we did bring together persons from various institutions across the region for a workshop designed to lead to action on campus with follow-up assistance provided by the project. Throughout these experiences we found that holding meetings away from the participants' campuses seemed to always work better than the workshops on the individual campuses. If arrangements could be made to get the participants away from their everyday environment, they would concentrate more on the substance of the workshop and become more enthusiastic about the ideas being presented. Faculty members away from their own campuses working with faculty from other campuses seem to be more open to examining their views and attitudes toward teaching and learning and less threatened than in their own home settings. We also found that one of the benefits of having several persons from the same institution was the feeling of mutual moral support for each other when trying to implement a program change upon the return home.

The External Agent

A subtle, but seemingly very important, factor in successful activities with institutions has seemed to be the fact that the Southern Regional Education Board was providing assistance or encouragement for the development of new ideas or changes. Many of our participants told us that they were able to succeed in developing activities on their campuses because of the authority they received from their connection to this outside agency. The fact that an organization like SREB was promoting a particular idea and supporting individuals in their efforts on campus seemed to make a difference in the way those ideas were accepted.

The strength of this concept of an "outside agent" seems to come from several factors. First, the fact that someone from an agency can make visits to a campus, such as our staff did, to explain ideas or to examine developments on the campus was very important to participants in the project. Second, we were able to encourage continuing activities and efforts aimed at accomplishing particular goals set in the beginning. It is clear that one time efforts rarely have significant influence on individual participants and little lasting impact on institutions. As external agents we seemed to be able to stimulate attention to matters that might never have come up within an institution, and also to encourage significant movement by continuing to provide subsequent action following the initial activity or contact. This follow-up sometimes took the form of evaluation questionnaires, a visit by the staff, sending a necessary consultant, or supporting a trip by one of the institutional participants to another institution. We felt that maintaining a continuing relationship was essential if a given effort was to reach a level of maturation that would sustain it without additional help.

The third factor which related to the concept of external influence and support has to do with finances. While in this project we had very few funds to distribute broadly to institutions, we found that even a few dollars could be used as "seed money" to bring focus to a particular activity or to stimulate broad efforts that often led to the identification of funds within the institutions. Sometimes proposals for outside funding have been developed for significant changes that would seem impossible before initial support for an activity. When we held workshops on topics of interest to faculty and paid only the basic costs, interested institutions could always find the necessary funds to cover the expenses of their own participants. In addition, we were frequently able to split the basic costs of an activity with some other agency or program when the interests and the purposes of the two coincided. For example, we were able to co-sponsor several workshops in the humanities areas with the National American Studies Faculty which helped encourage and support institutional participation.

A paper by W. Edmund Moomaw, following this section, explores the application of these change strategies on individual campuses. That paper reflects Dr. Moomaw's experiences while working at SREB as well as his current experience as a liberal arts college dean.

Professional Development for Regional Participants

This entire project began in the belief that a regional approach would help institutions and individuals in the South begin to think about new ideas and new directions in undergraduate education and build on a kind of mutual interest in further development. We frequently depended on resources within the region to stimulate others to move in new directions. In the beginning, the staff spent a great deal of time getting acquainted with the people who were known to be innovators and to have interesting and creative ideas. We visited institutions from which there was an indication of new programs or exciting ideas.

After becoming acquainted with these resources in the region, we then began to identify the individuals who could help others through workshops, conferences, and consultations. Many of our workshops for faculty were staffed by faculty members from other Southern institutions who had developed successful projects and could demonstrate them. This added to the use of limited resources because all of these innovators were interested in helping others and shared their experience and enthusiasm. Through this "self-help" approach, we were always able to find a way to provide some "trade-off" for the institutions providing the help. Repayment was not always direct and sometimes individuals gave far more than they

seemed to get. But eventually it seemed to work out that all those who assisted the project, and thereby other institutions as well, gained some advantage from having participated.

The other side of this approach is that the individuals who worked in our activities always expressed the feeling that they had personally gained a great deal from the experience. Just as we often say, "you don't know something very well until you teach it to someone else," these people gained new insights into their own activities when they began to prepare workshop presentations and activities to introduce others to their work or to serve as consultants in another institution. For many of these workshop leaders and participants this was the first time they had been called upon in such professional capacity and many people developed new skills and abilities through these activities.

Along with our focus on the development of specific improvements in teaching methodologies and in program structures, the project maintained a continual focus on the development of professions in higher education in the South. Many of our activities were, in fact, professional development activities. We often supported the travel of an individual from his or her home institution to another place to examine new ideas and to meet with innovative people. We frequently supplied information to individuals about professional development activities, and we encouraged persons from the South to attend national conferences and workshops that we knew would serve the interests and needs of institutions. In all of our planning groups and mutual interest work groups, we tried to combine individuals who would be resources to each other, and to design the work in such a way that participants could gain new information and experiences from the actual activities of planning as well as the resulting programs and workshops. We tried to organize each meeting of a group so that it would be a learning experience in itself and add to the professional growth of the participants.

Though unintended, one of the major accomplishments of the project may, in fact, have been the development of a network of new professionals who can carry on the activities of innovation and change in the South. This is a topic of a paper by John Stephenson which follows this section. In that paper, he explores in some depth several aspects of this development of human resources in the region.

These two areas, developing new strategies for change and encouraging the professional development of Southern participants in our project, have been major areas of work throughout these six years. We believe that many individuals in the region have learned a number of things about how to develop and guide change in their institutions, and how complex it is to develop innovations and new directions. At the same time, we believe that we have had an effect on the professional development of a number of individuals, so that there now exists a network of people who have been introduced to each other through project activities and can serve as a resource group for improvements of undergraduate education in this region.

The Challenge Remaining

Considerable progress has been made toward stimulating constructive change in undergraduate education in the South through the work of the Undergraduate Education Reform Project. Innovative and non-traditional approaches to teaching and learning have been developed in many places, and there are many individuals across the region who are capable of sustaining the momentum for reform if conditions permit. The situation today is quite different than it was even six years ago when the project began, and is especially different from the Sixties, when most of the focus was on coping with the growth potential and rising demands of students and society. Uncertain conditions today make it difficult for institutions and faculty to focus primarily on new ideas and innovations. As one project participant put it:

> The most pressing issue is to maintain and increase efforts to reform and improve in the face of ever-tightening and restrictive budgets. In the past five years, the reality of retrenchment has come to [our state] through increasing legislative involvement in fiscal matters. ... Students and the public expect and demand quality instruction and productivity on the part of faculty members, [and] unfortunately, many faculty members see this demand for accountability as a threat rather than a challenge to self-evaluation and improvement.

Out of every crisis come opportunities for change and new challenges. The present period in which our institutions find themselves offers those opportunities if only they can be seized. Another project participant responding to today's issues talks about those challenges:

> I think the pressure for accountability, declining enrollments, and shrinking funding will all lead to a greater receptivity on the part of the colleges to alter undergraduate education. The need for developmental programs, for entry and exit testing, for new curricula, for clearly defined outcomes, for greater flexibility in accomodating new and lifelong students, for improving college and university articulation, will all lead to change in education. With faculties becoming more and more entrenched and more costly to the institutions, the demand for increased productivity and programs to get faculty to visit other places or even to work in other places periodically will increase. Creating options for people's leisure time, enhancing job satisfaction through higher education, and offering new challenges to the most able students are also likely to lead to new reforms. Taken together, all of these represent exciting new possibilities for education.

The need is to get the faculty heavily involved in the dialogue about how to solve creatively the problems we face today; this will, in turn, help them to better understand the problems and conditions their institutions now face. It is not enough for only institutional and professional leaders to understand the new phenomena caused by today's diversity of students and a shrinking economy. Even if plans for non-traditional approaches are proposed and innovative programs are developed, those programs will have to be implemented by existing faculties working within the framework of traditional institutional structures. Because the faculty who staff our institutions came into the profession through education programs based on traditional assumptions about teaching and learning, new programs are likely not to be successful unless there is a conscious plan to stimulate faculty to think in new terms. At the same time, if we expect a creative and energetic response to the need for change, institutional leaders, administrators, and faculty have to support those efforts. Another project participant commented on this point:

> The reward system in institutions needs to be more closely associated with reform and improvement of instruction. In many instances non-tenured faculty members can hardly afford to divert any of their time and energy from research to systematic instructional improvement. In a related area, we need to find ways to work toward a "critical mass" of peer pressure which supports and rewards instructional improvement. Such encouragement from colleagues does not exist in significant amounts in most departments at the present time.

The way in which faculty are encouraged to participate in reform efforts is critical to the kind of results that can be expected. Through the Undergraduate Education Reform Project, we found that the process of involvement was important, and that various strategies, already mentioned, seem to encourage openness to change. While these strategies have been tried and described somewhat in the abstract, the focus of the change process would seem to be important also. We used similar strategies to encourage new ideas in teaching methods, program development, and institutional development. Most of our work, however, has been on the teaching role of faculty, which we have considered central. The process for developing new attitudes toward change in the future might well focus more on curriculum issues in undergraduate education. There is already evidence that change efforts are being widely directed toward general education, basic skills programs, and the relationship between career-related curricula and the liberal arts. It may be that this will appeal more to faculty than the focus on teaching improvement and faculty development. A project respondent feels that this is a new issue that must be dealt with. His analysis of the situation is as follows:

> After reviewing several years of efforts to determine what makes the difference in education, research data lead me to conclude that the content of the curriculum is probably the most significant determinant of learning outcomes. There is very little, if any, evidence that suggests the kind of teaching method used makes much difference when compared to other alternative teaching methods. This, then, suggests where our reform efforts should be: namely, in specifying new curricular areas and "remodeling" how we could improve the usefulness of present curriculum by identifying different kinds of performance requirements.

> Professors in higher education may be effective problem-solvers in their particular disciplines but seem to be inept when they encounter a problem of a more general nature outside their fields. Herman Kahn calls this "educated incompetence." This concept probably goes a long way in explaining why reform in higher education is so slow and so difficult to achieve. But what if the underlying problem is not "how to teach" but "what to teach"? A significant issue then is how to define reform. Is it change in means? Or a change in ends? I would opt for defining reform in terms of ends because there is plenty of evidence to show that there are several different ways in which one can achieve required learning outcomes.

An important area of work to be dealt with by those who would lead reform of undergraduate education is that of how to get more focus in our institutions on the learning process and the learning outcomes for students. In our work over these few years, we have been able only to scratch the surface of interest and information about how students learn and how to begin to assess the learning that does take place. This seems to be the remaining frontier for faculty; there are only a few pioneers working in the mass of institutions. We have been able to draw some attention to this subject in a few of our workshops and it always stimulated some participants to become very excited about the possibilities for new successes that such a focus on their work might bring. Several project participants have indicated this to be the area of most promise for future reform efforts. Some of their comments are:

> I tend to be "process" oriented as opposed to "structure" oriented. I believe the curriculum can help in providing educational direction, but it is the involvement of the learner in the learning process which is the crux of the learning opportunities being provided and the outcomes of these opportunities. Reform of undergraduate education can be achieved only if the mission and goals of undergraduate education are known to the educators, and only if the educators are committed to evaluation of their efforts toward achievement of these goals.

> We need to improve our abilities to assess learning as a means of evaluating and improving programs. We need to lean away from current global assessments [grades] to more discrete measures of what persons know and can do. Program and student articulation will remain a superficial process until we improve our assessment and certification procedures along more specific lines.

> Most college-level teachers are simply not concerned enough about how to get their students to learn more. Their main emphasis is on how to teach what they know. And there is a big difference between those two points of view. The first are learning facilitators. The latter group are educational dictators, and because they do not care or focus on how students in their classes learn, many of their students don't learn. The students are blamed for their lack of skill. The teacher never accepts that responsibility when learning isn't dominant.

These last comments point out quite bluntly the need for faculty interest to be turned more strongly toward how well students are learning what the institution has to offer. It is quite clear that genuine reform will not take place until faculty confront new conditions and seriously deal with the issues these conditions raise at the interface of *teaching* in the traditional sense, and *learning* in the context of today's need for alternative approaches to educational equality. The era of educational reform is not over, in spite of the appearance of a relative calm. The task is much more basic and less dramatic than it seemed eight or 10 years ago, but work must continue.

Encouraging Change on the College Campus

W. Edmund Moomaw
Birmingham-Southern College

We have been living in a new age for higher education for nearly fifteen years. How have we adapted? A short, off-the-cuff answer would be "neither very much nor very well." On the other hand, there have been some important changes in higher education in the past decade and a half. Modular calendars have been introduced; flexible degree programs for traditional and non-traditional students exist in many places; individualized study programs have been developed in a number of disciplines; experiential education is being advocated by a national organization and practiced by a large number of institutions; students are designing their own courses and major fields of study; they are being given a great deal of counseling about their future careers; and faculty and staff are participating in an array of "development" programs.

While those who advocate change and participate in trying to bring it about can point to these and other results, the urgent need for higher education to adapt still remains.

For the half-century prior to the early Sixties, colleges and universities in the United States developed and conducted their affairs pretty much according to their own desires. While they usually needed some kind of approval for their activities, boards and legislatures granted such approval with little debate and few questions were asked. Institutions admitted whomever they wished into their portals, using various aristocratic and meritocratic standards. It was difficult not to succeed. America was basically a growing, conservative, stratified society that had changed little, socially and educationally, except for some major technological advances, since World War II. There was an abundance of students for colleges and universities. A traditional liberal education was ideal for most of the students, since their futures were not uncertain. The national ecomony was sound. Inflation was something that happened in the banana republics! Teaching and learning had changed little over the years because no change was needed. Presidents and deans managed the internal affairs of their institutions, and all of them did relatively well.

In the 15 years since the beginning of the social and racial revolutions of the Sixties, enormous changes have taken place in America's society and its economy. These changes, in turn, have had profound effects on higher education – for which it was unprepared and with which it continues to grapple with uncertain results. Colleges and universitites were caught unprepared for the intrusion into their autonomy and tranquility of powerful external forces with which to reckon.

Encouraging change on the college campus is a sometimes difficult and frustrating activity. In this article, W. Edmund Moomaw discusses some of the reasons why faculty are frequently unhappy about possible changes, and ways they can be encouraged to understand the need for new directions and become involved in productive activities. Dr. Moomaw is Vice President and Dean of the Faculty at Birmingham-Southern College in Alabama. For four years he worked as the associate director of the Undergraduate Education Reform Project at SREB after having taught political science in a public college and a private women's college.

We have become an equalitarian society, with both a declining population and a declining economic situation. More people are going to college and demanding the traditional rewards associated with college education in another age. There are not sufficient professional positions for all of today's college graduates. Consequently, many are demanding more from their institutions. Students have become more competitive, more professional. They demand to know the economic value of what they are studying. Moreover, all of higher education's constituencies – students, faculty, the public – want to participate in policymaking and the decision process.

After a period of great growth in numbers, the general population decline is bringing new kinds of problems to campus. We have seen increasing external pressures from state agencies, the courts, legislatures, even the press – all demanding that higher education be accountable for what it is doing, and even giving advice and direction on what should be done. Advice has been given on what programs to provide, how to grade, what to research, whom and how to hire, how much to pay, and on other matters imaginable and unimaginable.

Perhaps the most significant response to higher education's new era has come from the private foundations and government. The foundations continue to pour tremendous sums of money into institutional, staff, and faculty development programs. Many foundations have commissioned studies, established special commissions, and conducted seminars for educational leaders. At the federal level, special agencies have been established to distribute the national largess to promote educational change. At the state and inter-state levels, such agencies as the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) have conducted programs to apprise institutions of new developments and new needs and to provide assistance for implementing institutional changes. What is missing on far too many campuses is a genuine and enthusiastic response by the faculty to the need for change.

The main activity on most college campuses today continues to be a time-based educational process in which faculty lecture and students write it all down in their notebooks and on exams weeks later. Curricular content also has changed little, though the society and the economy have changed dramatically.

It is probably true that all of us are much more comfortable with where we have been than where we are going. Most of today's faculty and administrators, either in fact or in spirit, have been in traditional elitist higher education during their graduate school years. A proposed change in that direction makes them very comfortable. A change which does not appear to be traditional creates the opposite effect. Therefore, it is important that ways be found to help faculty see the need for change and be helped to move in new directions in the most appropriate ways possible. In the remainder of this essay I want to suggest ways that some of the things learned about the change process in recent years can serve to overcome the forces and attitudes that prevent change on the campus and stimulate a positive environment for new ideas.

Factors Inhibiting Change

Often it seems simpler to describe what not to do rather than what to do – or what went wrong rather than what went right. It seems particularly appropriate here to give some attention to two factors that have been significant negative influences as campuses have struggled with the issue of change. The first factor is the inability of many institutions to develop the kind of administrative management system that can respond positively to today's external and internal pressures by means of innovative solutions.

The natural tendency of an administration in a time of stress is to become more bureaucratic. Such administrations trust subordinates less and centralize decisions more. They create more regulations to follow and give less and less discretion to those at the middle level. While such a college administration can succeed in normal times, it cannot succeed in a time when there are real problems to solve and programs to develop.

What is needed in today's new era in higher education is a more open model of administration. Such a model is one in which decisions are decentralized. Priorities and mission of the institution are widely shared and agreed upon, and each level of the institution is concerned about taking responsibility and getting the job done. A college or university administration with this type management system controls its own external and internal forces through open communication and responds to them in positive ways.

Faculty and staff have a high *esprit d'corps* because they feel involved and responsible for what happens. In an open model of administration, faculty and staff work positively toward the common mission of the institution.

The second factor inhibiting change in higher education today is that too many institutions insist upon trying to be an institution for all seasons. Today's pressures instead are calling upon institutions to specialize – to do only those things that each can do, and do well. In short, every institution needs to have a clear understanding of its mission and a commitment to it. For too many institutions today, the institutional mission remains the vague concept of being "the Harvard of . . . ." Many seem to be so commited to remaining forever a part of elitist higher education that adapting to serve the needs of a new clientele in a new era is beneath their dignity. The nationwide attention being given to Harvard's recent changes in general education requirements is a case in point. The national interest in emulating the Harvard curriculum illustrates the failure of diverse institutions to develop their own diverse missions.

Steps in the Change Process

Bringing about change involves much more than simply the development of brilliant ideas. When asked once to define the powers of the presidency, Harry Truman replied: "I sit here all day trying to persuade people to do what they ought to have sense enough to do without my persuading them. That's all the powers of the president amount to." In short, how we approach things is as important as what we propose to do.

The change process can be said to involve four distinct steps: defining the problem, developing solutions, implementing the plan, and evaluating the results. In the evaluation process, additional problems may be defined, starting the process again. While the four steps may be viewed as distinct, activities in the steps do not necessarily take place separately from each other.

1. Defining the Problem

The first step in the change process is to reach consensus on the definition of the problem. Two avenues available to facilitate problem definition are use of an "outside agent," and use of the evaluation process.

The literature on processes of change contains many testimonials to the benefits of the outside agent concept. The SREB Undergraduate Education Reform Project acted as an outside agent to persuade people of the existence of problems that all of them probably already knew existed. It is not merely the change agent being from the outside that makes the difference, however. It is important to choose an outside agent that will command the respect of the members of the institutional community. The SREB change plan involved taking change teams from a number of institutions to a neutral location to work not only with the outside agent but also away from the home campus atmosphere and in a supportive peer group environment.

Another means to begin problem definition is through the evaluation process. Evaluation of programs, majors, departments, or a whole curriculum can be organized for this purpose. Data-gathering can be conducted on campus with outside evaluators brought in to assess the data and to assist in the process of problem identification.

It is particularly important that the change agent avoid simply making a declaration of the existence of the problem or of a solution. There needs to be at least some consensus on the existence of a problem, and this consensus needs to be based on legitimate research and hard information. Once the problem has been identified and its existence acknowledged, even if only by a small group of influential opinion leaders, an institution has achieved the first step in the change process. It is probably fruitless to attempt to develop and implement a new idea if few people on the campus perceive that a problem exists.

2. Developing Solutions

This essay suggests that developing and implementing a change plan involves two separate steps in the change process. However, change may be more of an incremental process than a process that moves from one stage to another. It is probably a mistake to assume that it is possible to develop a complete plan and

then to implement it in its entirety. Instead, the process seems to work best when solutions are implemented incrementally – one by one – and then evaluated before the next step is taken. Indeed, it may not even be desirable to map out all the details of a change plan at once. Instead, development and implementation may be simultaneous activities.

The most successful approach to developing a change plan is to put together a small leadership team to organize and direct the effort. It is usually best that this be a new group made up of persons from all concerned constituencies who are agreed on the existence of the problem and the desirability of finding a solution or of moving in a particular direction. It is very helpful to have persons who have connections with other campus groups – formal or informal – who can represent those groups and perhaps help persuade them when the time comes.

It is of vital importance that the change team have connections or assistance from outside the campus. Working with teams from other institutions who are dealing with the same issue is particularly helpful. Such connections may take place through a national or regional project, or by working through a formal or informal consortium. These outside linkages provide an opportunity for the change team to gain new ideas. The outside connections provide support in problem-solving and in identifying resource persons.

As the change team moves ahead with the development of the solution(s) it plans to propose, it is important that it either expand its membership or take some other action which will involve more persons in the process. This step will gain the commitment of additional people to the proposed solution. One way of lessening the threat on campus is for the change team to hold frequent open forums or "hearings" to keep the entire community informed. Nothing can kill an innovation more quickly than the impression that a small cabal is plotting secretly to commit an outrage. In the process of change, there is never too much communication or sharing of information.

3. Implementation

An ancient Chinese proverb tells us that, "A journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step." The Chinese must have had some foreknowledge of American higher education. It is next to impossible to develop a complete curricular change package and implement it in its entirety. The best strategy is to implement a programmed change step-by-step, evaluating each step after it is implemented and making necessary adjustments before moving to implementation of the next step. Incremental, gradual implementation has the advantage of getting an organization accustomed to small changes, one at a time, rather than one large change all at once. Small, incremental changes are much more likely to be supported. In addition, the change itself is more likely to be successful since it is being evaluated and adjusted at each step.

In addition to being incremental, advocates of change often must be willing to have their changes implemented merely on a trial basis for a limited time. This often seems illogical to the change agent, and indeed it is. It might be argued that the burden of proof ought to be on the defenders of the *status quo*, but that simply is not the nature of change. If the proposed concept is valid, it will prove its merit in any case. Moreover, since change is an ongoing process, it would not be logical for a change agent to advocate permanent adoption of any idea.

4. Evaluation: Keeping the Process Moving

Yesterday's change agent often is today's defender of the *status quo*. While it violates the concept that we must always be able to change to adapt to new circumstances, it is nonetheless true that many change agents develop such a strong commitment to their "baby" that they consider it a personal affront to have it tampered with in the future.

The way to deal with this problem is to have a built-in process of continuous evaluation that identifies problems and develops solutions. In short, the ideal situation is a change process that is going on continuously. It is often the case that faculty are most comfortable with an innovation when it is begun with a limited life-span requiring evaluation and renewal within a certain time period. This, of course, is merely Thomas Jefferson's notion that each generation should have the privilege of developing its own rules of society. The irony is that most faculty will agree to this concept only for new programs, not for the old ones. But, be that as it may, the concept is a good one because it forces the change process to be what it should be – continuous.

Conclusion

This essay has concentrated on the process of change. Of course, change is much more than process. The purpose of the process is merely to facilitate the main matter – namely, the development of substantive solutions to the problems that confront us. Many good ideas have gone awry because the advocate of the change followed the wrong procedure. Good ideas are not adopted merely because of the soundness of the argument for them. They are adopted, to use President Truman's word, because people are *persuaded* to adopt them. Changes, to be positive and effective, must be accepted and to gain acceptance one must follow a careful strategy.

In summary, this essay has proposed a change process consisting of four steps. These steps, in turn, suggest four principles of change which the author learned by trial and error through the efforts of SREB's Undergraduate Education Reform Project.

First, bringing about change is a process of solving problems. Identification and agreement on the existence of the problem is the necessary first step.

Second, change must take place within the tradition of higher education. While there are some new institutions that can successfully ignore this principle, most must live with this reality and develop strategies accordingly.

Third, use of outside agents and other outside contacts may be the single most important and effective strategy that can be used in traditional higher education. While the original fountain of wisdom may exist at each individual institution, it is the influence and opinions brought in from respected outside sources that cause the greatest amount of new thinking.

Fourth, change, to be successful, should be incremental and continuous. It rarely works to impose a completely new structure on any organization. More important, it is even less likely that today's innovation will serve all generations to come. There needs to be change process, therefore, that allows for continuous evaluation and continuous incremental change. The change agent must be comfortable not only with changing the *status quo* at the time but also with future alterations of his own changes.

The Lasting Impact of Reform: The Development of Human Resources in the South

John B. Stephenson
University of Kentucky

In evaluating the effects of any project whose major objective is change, the question naturally arises, "What remains when the project is finished?" In the case of the Undergraduate Education Reform (UER) Project, the obvious evidence to look for concerning lasting results is in the reforms themselves. But another outcome, one which was not originally a major goal of the project, but which now appears to be one of great importance, also shows strong evidence of remaining in place, now that the project itself is completed. That outcome is the establishment of informal and formal structures of communication and use of expertise which have been developed in many instances as a direct result of the project. This development of human resources, and the development of patterns of information exchange and utilization, now appear to be among the most important, if unanticipated, results of the UER Project.

"Human resources" is more than just a "catch" phrase. It refers to the embodiment of knowledge and skills in persons who can put expertise to work in solving problems and in providing leadership for progressive change. It refers also to organizational patterns – either new organizational forms or the reorganization of individuals into new patterns which improve potentials for problem-solving and leadership. In terms of the UER Project's contributions to the strengthening of human resources for improving undergraduate education in the South, it became clear, as the project unfolded during its six-year lifetime, that numerous individuals experienced personal and professional growth; that supportive networks, both formal and informal, took shape; and that communication about change, innovation, and improvements increased at many levels from intra-institutional to national. It also became clear to observers and staff of the project that had it not been for the opportunities provided by the UER Project, the growth of these human resources would have taken place much more slowly and, in some instances, probably not at all.

What were these opportunities, and how did they lead to the strengthening of resources for the improvement of undergraduate education in the South? What is the evidence of such strengthened resources? Without pretending to any definitive or exhaustive treatment, these questions will be addressed through examples, illustrations, and some limited generalizations in the remainder of this essay.

The professional development of participants in the UER project was an important concern of the staff. Though this was not listed as a major objective of the project at its inception, it was a major consideration as we planned and conducted our activities. John Stephenson helped the staff consider directions the project should take, participated in a number of activities related to his own institution and served as a member of several committees. During the six years of the Undergraduate Education Reform Project Dr. Stephenson was Dean of Undergraduate Studies at the University of Kentucky and is now Director of the Appalachian Studies Program there.

Project Procedures

The project began to take shape around conferences and workshops on limited topics and involving circumscribed groups of participants rather than the entirety of the region's higher education constituency. By the time of the final phases of the project in 1979, a very large number of these conferences and workshops had been held throughout the region, and these activities provided major opportunities for both personal professional strengthening and increased communications on a variety of critical topics. Individuals were sometimes brought together from the entire region and sometimes from within one state or local area to exchange ideas and share new knowledge. In some cases, the same group was brought together more than once; for others, it was a one-time experience. In all cases, the meetings provided unique opportunities to meet new people, hear new ideas, and test new plans for implementation. These exchanges were carried out in a positive atmosphere, and permitted faculty members and administrative staff to work with their counterparts in other institutions who could reinforce the sense of the importance of each other's work. These shared activities provided chances to build valuable communication links as well as to build self-concepts, increase personal knowledge, and, in some cases, to redirect professional careers.

In addition to the conferences and workshops themselves, a number of planning sessions were conducted in preparation for them. Although they involved a smaller number of people, these occasions were important in helping cement connections among individuals. Planning activities themselves took on the character of resource inventories, state-of-the-art assessments, needs analyses, and the kind of "show-and-tell" exchanges which are inevitable when two or more people gather with similar program interests.

Resource Development

Looking back over the six years and the hundreds of people involved in all the UER Project activities, there are several aspects, in terms of resource development, which are worth pointing out. The first is that a large number of individuals who probably would not otherwise have been involved in undergraduate education reform were drawn into these events. In many cases, the net effect may have been negligible in terms of concrete changes on campuses, but the undeniable fact is that many people became knowledgeable about educational innovations. Moreover, these persons might otherwise have experienced that distinct kind of isolation which accompanies the perception that one is toiling alone. The reinforcement of feelings of working in common with others elsewhere is not a small achievement.

A second generalization to be drawn from the standpoint of human resource development has to do with the central role of the project staff in the regional communications patterns which emerged. It would not be difficult to document this point from the testimony of dozens of persons involved in various phases of the project. Project staff, in fact, came to be looked upon by most participants as the major data bank where most of the valuable information on people and programs in the region (and nationally) was stored. Thus, as time passed, the staff was called upon increasingly to supply names of prospective consultants, workshop participants, and conference speakers. The centrality of project staff in the communications network is important to understand not only because such good staff work always deserves recognition, but because it calls attention to a possible continuing need which, if not met in some fashion, may endanger an important element of the informal structure which built up slowly over the six years of the project. It is possible that, without this centralized bank of information and advice, the other, more peripheral communications links may become weakened and fade away fairly quickly. The possibility of this loss of centripetal force should, at least, not be ignored.

Other generalizations can be drawn from the project experiences which have relevance for human resource development, and we will return to them later. Let us turn now to an exploration of the ways in which the project strengthened the capacities of individuals and groups of people in the region to reform undergraduate education.

Tracing Results

The most interesting source of information available for illustrating the impact of the project on human resource development is the set of responses received on a questionnaire mailed out to 174 individuals who had participated in one or another phase of the project during its lifetime. These persons were

chosen to receive the questionnaire on the basis of the particular part of the project they were involved with, and the type of institution they were in. Ninety-three persons returned the questionnaire. Of the three questions asked of the respondents, two are of interest to us here:

- What impact, if any, did project participation have on your institution? Have there been any direct or indirect results from your or others' participation? Can you give examples of specific actions taken or changes made?
- What impact, if any, did project participation have on you personally? Can you give any examples of new contacts you made or new knowledge you gained as a result of your participation with us?

Because this material was solicited for purposes of illustration rather than statistical generalization, strict representativeness is not as important as variety in type of institution and area of the South. The testimony available from this source indicates that impact was felt from the project in at least the following ways:

personal and professional development;

widened contacts;

continued use of consultation and exchange of information, increased communication about educational change;

increased use of publications dealing with educational change;

enhancement of visibility or credibility of current efforts;

campus faculty/staff development programs begun or strengthened;

involvement in or creation of some organization dealing with educational change;

outside funding received to support educational change effort.

Personal and Professional Development

Apparently, very few persons participating in one or another phase of the project felt they did not benefit personally from their involvement. Quite frequently, the benefit identified by the participant went beyond merely gaining new knowledge or insight and included new or expanded involvement in a change effort. One person, writing about a workshop on prior learning, noted that

> . . . it has provided new possibilities for me. I have been involved for eight years with sponsored learning. The prior learning workshop was my introduction to what is to be an important dimension in postsecondary education. I am pursuing the prior learning by a self-designed course of study. Recently, I have assumed on a part-time basis the role of regional manager for CAEL [The Council for the Advancement of Experiential Learning], a position which provides the possibility of working in both prior and sponsored learning.

Another noted that ". . . project participation has broadened my base of administrative experience and provided me tools and resources in my work with faculty."

Some individuals attributed their professional career advancement to participation in the project. One individual attributed his winning of an award for outstanding teaching to his participation in a UER workshop. One person cited his promotion; another said he had been designated the primary contact at his college for all professional development programs as a result of project participation. Another had been appointed to a statewide committee on faculty development by his administrators. Another stated that "participation in the project resulted in a broadening of my career in that I became involved in faculty development activities on a full-time basis." He concluded by saying that his involvement "has probably had more impact on my personal professional development than any other single event since I joined the faculty."

Unquestionably the strongest testimony concerning personal professional development was contained in this statement:

> In addressing a graduate class in higher education recently, I compared my participation in the project . . . in 1974 to St. Paul's conversion on the road to Damascus. Even disallowing the excessive rhetoric chosen for that occasion, the workshop was essentially the beginning

> of a new career for me, one which led me, I think, to make a new and significant contribution as a faculty member at the [University] and eventually led to a new position as Director of the Office of Instructional Development at [another] university.

He concluded his statement by saying that "at this point, I see no end to the professional and intellectual growth triggered by my participation in the project." While such total "conversion" was the exception rather than the rule, it was common for respondents to cite some area of new knowledge or skill gained from participation.

It is clear, then, that the six years of the project saw a number of individuals in the region increase their knowledge of new currents in undergraduate education. This means that there is now a larger pool of human resources from which all institutions in the South (and the nation) can draw for expertise and for administrative and faculty leadership on individual campuses, in statewide systems, and in area and multistate consortia. Certainly this is one residue of the project which will continue to contribute to the improvement of undergraduate education far into the future.

Widened Contacts

Scarcely less important is the widening of contacts among persons working in particular areas of educational change. The value of discovering that others are working on similar problems, often with quite similar frustrations, cannot be overstated. One participant stated the principle well when he noted that "because the support base for those interested in change is often quite small within an institution, opportunities to meet others at various conferences have been very important." This is because, to quote another respondent, "it is rare for any person or single institution to stand alone and break the new ground." He and others at his institution have "learned how important it is for [projects] to gain legitimacy and support as they move into new approaches to the delivery of educational services." From the contacts made at workshops and conferences, participants not only learned how programs were successfully implemented at various institutions, they also learned what did *not* work. A respondent who participated in a workshop on prior learning put the point well when he said that assessment procedures used at certain other schools were "frightfully loose, and have made it difficult for me to propose that [we] undertake any effort to investigate the usefulness of such a program of evaluation for [our] adults." He goes on to make the point that:

> Separating a policy from a bad application of that policy is difficult under most circumstances and, in the context of a faculty community, it is almost always impossible. My meeting administrators who have operated what seem to be academically sound approaches to prior learning assessment gave me names to direct faculty questions toward.

Thus, it was instructive for participants to be in contact with individuals representing both successful and unsuccessful programs.

The themes of personal professional development and widened contacts were often combined, as participants recalled their involvement with the project:

> As a result of my involvement with SREB's project, I was able to successfully lead an effort to establish a very unique academic division and to ultimately head that division. That led to a position as Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs and the supervision of a variety of academic units. The contacts were the same. I knew no one in the area of instructional innovations before the UER conference. Now the contacts are extensive and I have even published in the area.

But quite aside from professional advancement, and indeed aside from the gaining of new knowledge and skills, there is repeated emphasis placed on the value of meeting people who reinforce the value of what one is doing. The influence of such reinforcement on sustained commitment to improving undergraduate education is phrased eloquently but simply in this statement:

> . . . the obvious impact and the most important was my personal sense of belonging to a community of devoted teachers. Contact with colleagues from other institutions reinforced my already strong commitment to quality undergraduate instruction.

One might conclude from such an observation, which was repeated many times by questionnaire respondents, that individuals working toward improvements in undergraduate education on their own campuses are all starved for attention and support. The question, "Why this should be the case?" is an interesting one, but the experience of most of us confirms that it is easier to work together on such problems away from the home campus – even for faculty and staff from the same campus. Not only are there competing distractions and constant reminders on campus about where our reward structures suggest we should be placing our time and efforts (not in wasteful discussions of elusive "reform"), but there is an overall pervasive atmosphere of cynicism about change and improvement. Even the term "innovation" has negative connotations on some campuses. Whatever the reason, we all understand what one respondent means when he laments plaintively, "it seems that we can't get colleagues together so productively here."

The value of new contacts made was cited by persons whose own improvement efforts represented every stage of development from early conceptualization to complete institutionalization, but they were naturally more valuable to those just getting underway. One individual, whose program had been in operation less than a year, commented that:

> . . . the meeting [organized by UER] in 1976 was the single most rewarding professional meeting that I have ever attended. As the director of a center which opened in July, 1975, I was seeking direction, new ideas, and feedback regarding the value of our early efforts. I got all of these, and came away knowing that we were on the right track.

Many others cited ways in which contacts made at conferences or workshops had had specific influence on the way in which they designed or modified programs, or gave them entirely new program ideas.

Consultation and Exchange of Information

Of course, contacts made through the UER Project will have value beyond the life of the project only to the extent that they are maintained. To what extent did participants continue to make use of these contacts once they were made?

The answer is that apparently a tremendous number of contacts made in UER conferences and workshops have been followed up for consulting purposes and for further exchange of information, ideas, and assistance of various kinds. Dozens of examples were cited in the questionnaire material. Typical is the case of an individual who participated in a meeting on staff development centers, and who commented that "these contacts led to further telephone conversations, exchanges of information, and visits." A participant in another meeting likewise noted that "there was extensive exchange of material during and after the workshop (cognitive mapping made available systematic collection of course descriptions from other institutions)."

Some colleges hired as consultants and evaluators persons who were on UER programs, and in a number of instances, quite importantly, these were persons who were first-time consultants. The importance of this fact is that the region, through the project, was building a resource bank made up of its own experts in educational change. While it is true that a number of project participants went on to seek the assistance of educational consultants from outside the South, it appears that much of the consulting traffic involved "home-grown" experts who were first identified and "developed" through the UER Project. This means that it is now possible to identify professionals in the South with consulting experience in such fields as competency-based education (one institution said that it has received requests for information from over 500 other institutions in the past few years – many from outside the South), the assessment of prior learning, faculty development programs, personalized self-instruction, centers for instructional improvement, systems for evaluating faculty performance, and the like.

It would be too much to say that no such expertise existed in the region before the project began. But it is probable that much of this talent was underutilized. Another respondent gave testimony to the existence of this "framework of expertise" when he said that:

> . . . participation in the project enabled [our] faculty members to establish contact with a number of innovative leaders in teaching improvement efforts in Southern schools and to develop a network of friends with whom they can exchange ideas as they continue to work for improvements in teaching and learning.

Publications as a Resource

Another kind of communication which will endure beyond the lifetime of the project is publications of various kinds. Awareness of publications available from SREB and the UER project, such as the primer on competency-based curricula (*A CBC Primer*) spread rapidly through mailings and dissemination at conferences. Typical of comments made by questionnaire respondents were, "The publications of the Board have been particularly useful for us in educating our faculty . . . ," and "The publications produced by the project have proved pertinent to the situation at our institution and have been valuable to us." Similarly, awareness grew of publications available from national sources, such as the Council for the Advancement of Experiential Learning's "Principles of Good Practice in Assessing Experiential Learning." Equally significant, however, was the appearance of new publications from the campuses themselves. For example:

> . . . from the experience of another university we adopted the idea of sharing the outcomes of our mini-sabbatical program with other faculty through the publication of reports.
>
> . . . the center plans to develop a teaching notes publication, the desirability of which was demonstrated through various contacts and discussions with others who have such a publication.
>
> . . . publication of the yellowbook and the distribution of the reprints caused many people to inquire about our operations and come visit us when planning a center in another university.

Joint publication efforts, such as the UER pamphlet entitled *The External Degree Program: Florida International University*, were circulated widely, as this respondent from Florida International indicates:

> This pamphlet quickly became a vital tool for explaining the program to a variety of people off the campus, including members of the local community, legislators, state university system officers, and people throughout the country interested in non-traditional study. On campus, it proved to be an equally valuable tool in explaining the program to entering students and to faculty members who were prospective external degree advisors. For the program's staff, the publication of the pamphlet gave us the opportunity to look back at several years' hard work and see our accomplishments.

The frequency with which various types of publication are mentioned in the questionnaire replies confirms the conclusion drawn from first-hand experience: the printed word still communicates effectively, at least in academic circles. Indeed, good publications take on a life of their own, for this reason, the already-published material and the published material which will continue to emerge from various activities spawned by the UER Project will continue to serve as a vital element in the communication links which survive the project itself.

Indirect Results

In some instances, the project had a rather indirect influence on the development of human resources for undergraduate educational change. In two or three cases, for example, the major impact of project involvement seems to have been the enhancement in the eyes of colleagues – sometimes on campus, sometimes off. A new program related to a prestigious organization is more than a mere entity; it is essential to legitimizing that activity in the view of those who would otherwise look at it askance. One individual notes that "involvement with SREB has lent credibility to our on-campus efforts." The project increased the level of recognition and created the opportunities for initial contacts to be made with them. One questionnaire respondent, in fact, remarks that he "gained visibility on a regional and national basis as a result of participation in project activities. As a consequence I have been asked to assume various leadership roles in the faculty development field." (With what one presumes is typical Southern modesty, he adds, "I don't know whether to consider this a positive or negative impact.")

Again, the role of the project staff in serving as a communications "center" should be noted. It seems that if one needed to recall a name or needed a contact in a new area, the natural tendency was to call SREB. Even if the staff had not intended this to be a major function of the office, it nevertheless became, as one person called it, a clearinghouse.

> The impact, it seems to me, has been the project's providing our institution with a point of contact, or clearinghouse if you please, for seeking information on matters related to undergraduate curriculum reform. On numerous occasions over the years I have referred people to the SREB offices for information.

In many instances, staff leadership was cited by name as being involved in providing critical or highly useful information and advice for campus or multi-campus programs, leaving little doubt about the importance of central staff in the continuing consultation patterns which followed project participation.

To return to the main point, not only was expertise developed through the project, and not only did project activities allow opportunities for initial contact to be made with persons working on similar programs, but these contacts were followed up and informal networks of communication began to grow. As one participant said:

> I have met, and in some instances I have become friends with, a number of individuals on whom we have been able to call for expert advice. Relationships with SREB activities have tended to provide "a framework of expertise."

A representative of another institution, which had played a consulting role to many other campuses, comments, "we have learned how important it is for them to gain legitimacy and support as they move into new approaches to the delivery of educational services." Thus, the fact that the UEB Project brought outside recognition to on-campus change efforts was in itself a strengthening factor.

In other cases, the impact of the project on human resource development was very direct. Several campuses organized staff and faculty development programs which, if successful, will result in an enriched pool of expertise on a variety of educational alternatives in the region. In other cases, involvement in the project led directly to involvement in other organized efforts to improve undergraduate education, such as the Project on Institutional Renewal through the Improvement of Teaching and CAEL. And in yet other instances, project involvement led to successful proposals for external funding for innovative programs. In all these ways, the project will be survived by other organizational forms, on campuses and among campuses, which will continue to develop people who will develop others.

It should not be concluded, of course, that everything touched by the UEB Project turned to gold. In many cases, involvement of individuals and institutions in conferences and workshops led to no visible change or further involvement. Questionnaires were sent to a number of persons on campuses where little impact had been detected by project staff, and the responses do indeed indicate that no impact was felt in some of these cases. It would be too much to expect from any such effort that every participating institution would realize benefits. Many were simply not at the stage of readiness or receptiveness. In other instances, it is possible that more appropriate individuals could have been identified as institutional representatives. It is possible, on the other hand, that some of these campuses will participate in subsequent reform efforts and will be in a position to take advantage of the now available expertise in the region.

Interestingly, in some cases where individuals reported little or no impact from the project, it was clear that benefits had been received from project participation. In some cases, increased sensitivity to the need for change was noted. In others, communication at various levels -- within campuses, within statewide systems, among consortia, and among like-minded persons around the country -- had obviously increased. It was clear, in short, that some of the conclusions of "no impact" were products of personal discouragement occasioned by high aspirations and difficult circumstances. In one case, a questionnaire respondent recited a lengthy paragraph filled with change-oriented activities which had occurred on his campus but concluded with the lament that "nothing very concrete has happened, but there has been, at least, some heightening of awareness." Success depends, one supposes, on what concrete goals one hopes to attain, but if the *process* of change has been strengthened, as in this case, it is difficult to conclude that there has been no impact.

Looking to the Future

In looking toward the future, two observations seem warranted. The first and most obvious is that the region is in a much better position than it was before the inception of the project to deal with the challenges of change in a number of areas of undergraduate education. The SREB states now boast a significant number of knowledgeable and skilled individuals who can be called on to assist in a variety of aspects

of educational reform. Networks of communication and consultation have grown as a result of the project, a number of relevant publications have come into being and are being circulated widely, and involvement in other organized efforts in educational change has increased. Most of these human resources will remain beyond the lifetime of the project.

The second observation is that we must recognize the obstacles which remain and which need to be dealt with on a continuing basis if our human resources are to be properly used. Awareness of the need for change is still not as salient among educational institutions in the South as it probably should be. Faculty blame administrators for showing no interest in change, and administrators point their fingers at faculty. Neither group has a monopoly on virtue in this regard. While many faculty complain about lack of administrative support for certain programs, it must be recognized that faculty awareness and support is frequently just as much a problem.

Most problems such as these can be overcome with time if key individuals are encouraged to continue giving them attention. The problem of sustaining attention thus appears to be most critical. The focusing of attention on reform problems has in fact been what the UER Project has accomplished over a six-year period. Without the UER Project and its staff at the center, it is possible that the various change efforts now occurring in the region would have become increasingly peripheral, scattered, and unknown to each other. Only time will tell how long the human resource potentials and the communication structures created by the project will actually remain in place.

Of all the areas of the nation, the Southern region probably has the greatest potential for sustaining networks among individuals and institutions working on comparable problems. "Networking" comes naturally to most people in this region, possibly just because it *is* the South. The SREB Undergraduate Education Reform Project has built successfully upon this natural foundation of sharing and desire for sustained personal contact, and one can only hope that, even without the advantage of continued support furnished by this project from its "centralized" communications locus, this very Southern impetus to "stay in touch" will allow us to use our newly developed human resources to maximum advantage.

Appendix

Regional Resources for Change in Undergraduate Education

The following programs and persons in the region can serve as resources for others interested in various topics or areas of work. It is not meant to be exhaustive nor representative. Most of the persons listed have been involved in UER Project activities during the life of the project.

Competency-Based Institutions

Mars Hill College
Mars Hill, North Carolina
Richard Hoffman, Dean
David Knisley, Associate Dean

Our Lady of the Lake University
San Antonio, Texas
Albert Griffith, Dean
Sister Virginia Clare Duncan, Associate Dean

Kentucky Community College System
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky
Stanley Wall, Vice President
Shay Jaggard, Coordinator of Staff and Program Development
Marie Piekarski, Coordinator of Program Planning and Development

Several programs in each of the 13 community colleges are developing competency curricula.

External Degree Programs

External Degree Program
New College
University of Alabama
University, Alabama
Bernard Sloan, Dean of New College
Harriett Cabell, Director

External Degree Program
Florida International University
Miami, Florida
Ike Palmore, Director
Connie Clark, Associate Director

Program for Experienced Learners
Eckerd College
St. Petersburg, Florida
Clark H. Bauwman, Dean of Special Programs

Special Programs for Adults

University College
Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee
Robert Hatala, Dean

Women's Center
Adult Degree Program
Mary Baldwin College
Staunton, Virginia
Dudley B. Luck, Director

Bachelor of Liberal Studies Program
Mary Washington College
Fredericksburg, Virginia
A. R. Merchant, Director

Non-Traditional Studies Program
Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, Virginia
Nicholas Sharp, Director

Faculty Development Centers and Programs

Teaching-Learning Center
University of Alabama
University, Alabama
Don Snow, Coordinator

Center for Educational Development and Evaluation
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida
Al Oosterhof, Director

Office of Instructional Resources
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida
Jeaninne Webb, Director

Office of Instructional Resources
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky
Roger Koonce, Director

Center for Enhancement of Teaching Effectiveness
Murray State University
Murray, Kentucky
Luann Wilkerson, Director

Faculty Center for Instructional Development
Southern University of New Orleans
New Orleans, Louisiana
Malak Abou-Hargah, Director

Teaching-Learning Resources Center
University of Southern Mississippi
Hattiesburg, Mississippi
Emory Howell, Director

Center for Instructional Development
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina
William C. Hubbard, Coordinator

Faculty Development Program
St. Andrews Presbyterian College
Laurinburg, North Carolina
Ronald C. Crossley, Dean

Office of Faculty Development and Research
College of Charleston
Charleston, South Carolina
John M. Bevan, Vice President for Academic Affairs

Program for Faculty Development
Furman University
Greenville, South Carolina
Phil Winstead, Coordinator for Institutional Planning and Research

Center for Learning Research and Service
Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee
G. Douglas Mayo, Director

Learning Research Center
University of Tennessee – Knoxville
Knoxville, Tennessee
Ohmer Milton, Director

Faculty Development Resource Center
University of Texas at Arlington
Arlington, Texas
Mary Lynn Crow, Director

Teaching Effectiveness Center
University of Houston-Downtown College
Houston, Texas
Jerry Perkus, Coordinator

Center for Teaching Effectiveness
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas
James E. Stice, Director

Center for Instructional Development
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, Virginia
Anne Raymond-Savage, Director

Learning Resources Center
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia
Stanley H. Huffman, Director

Center for Improving Teaching Effectiveness
Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, Virginia
John Noonan, Director

Revised Faculty Evaluation Programs
(Institutions Participating in the SREB Faculty Evaluation Project, 1977-79.)

Anderson College
Anderson, South Carolina
Brenda B. Walker, Department of English

Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama
Gerald Johnson, Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences

Augusta College
Augusta, Georgia
Harold Moon, Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences

Austin College
Sherman, Texas
Dan Bedsole, Dean of the College

Austin Community College
Austin, Texas
Grace Olfs, Coordinator of Curriculum and Instruction

Barry College
Miami Shores, Florida
Sr. Marie Siena Chmara, Professor of Education

Birmingham-Southern College
Birmingham, Alabama
Diane Brown, Associate Professor of French

DeKalb Community College
Clarkston, Georgia
William Cheek, Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs

Delgado College
New Orleans, Louisiana
Alice Rusbar, Assistant to the President

Florida International University
Miami, Florida
Paul D. Gallagher, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs

Henderson State University
Arkadelphia, Arkansas
Louis Dawkins, Dean, School of Business

Hinds Junior College
Raymond, Mississippi
John Perritt, Instructional Development Officer

Jackson State Community College
Jackson, Tennessee
Robert A. Harrell, Dean of Academic Affairs

Kentucky State University
Frankfort, Kentucky
Thomas J. Vest, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs

Mary Washington College
Fredericksburg, Virginia
Roy F. Gratz, Assistant Professor of Chemistry

Mississippi College
Clinton, Mississippi
Wendell Deer, Chairman, Department of Mathematics

Mississippi State University
Starkville, Mississippi
George Verrall, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs

North Carolina A&T State University
Greensboro, North Carolina
G. F. Rankin, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

North Lake College
Irving, Texas
Glen Bounds, Vice President of Instruction

North Texas State University
Denton, Texas
Howard Smith, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

Piedmont Technical College
Greenwood, South Carolina
Margaret Martin, Department of Psychology

St. Mary's Dominican College
New Orleans, Louisiana
Pamela Menke, Academic Dean

St. Petersburg Junior College
St. Petersburg, Florida
Carl Fraze, Director of Personnel

Shepherd College
Shepherdstown, West Virginia
Charles W. Carter, Assistant Professor of English

Spelman College
Atlanta, Georgia
Kathryn Brisbane, Academic Dean

Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee, Alabama
William Lester, Assistant Provost

University of Arkansas at Little Rock
Little Rock, Arkansas
Harri Baker, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
Pine Bluff, Arkansas
Sellars Parker, Dean of Agriculture and Technology

University of Texas Health Science Center
San Antonio, Texas
Armand Guarino, Dean of the Graduate School

Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, Virginia
Robert Armour, Associate Professor of English